

Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service



A N N I V E R S A R Y
1941 - 1991

JPRS Report

China

REFLECTIONS ON HU FENG COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY CASE

19980203 125

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

China
REFLECTIONS ON HU FENG
COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY CASE

JPRS-CAR-91-037

CONTENTS

27 June 1991

Reflections on Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Case

Lin Mohan Tells Story of Anti-Hu Feng Campaign [ZUOPIN YU ZHENGMIN No 2]	1
Hu Feng's Wife Refutes Lin Mohan's View of Hu Feng Case [ZUOPIN YU ZHENGMIN No 2]	21
Lin Mohan Corrects Previous Assertions on Hu Feng Case [ZUOPIN YU ZHENGMIN No 2]	27

Lin Mohan Tells Story of Anti-Hu Feng Campaign

91CM0356A Beijing ZUOPIN YU ZHENGMI
[LITERARY WORKS AND CONTENTION]
in Chinese No 2, 17 Feb 91 pp 57-73, 9

[Article as narrated by Lin Mohan (2651 7871 3211) to Huang Huaying (7806 5478 5391): "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case—First Part of an Interview With Lin Mohan"; originally published in XIN WENXUE SHILIAO [NEW LITERATURE HISTORICAL DATA] No 3, 1989]

[Text] I.

Question: Ever since the Central Committee's political rehabilitation of Comrade Hu Feng, newspapers and magazines have published a series of articles written by Hu Feng himself, his family, and others. As a participant in the Hu Feng case, what is your understanding and views of events before and after the Hu Feng case? Will you explain them to us?

Answer: Yes. However, I only know a part. The incident took place many years ago, and it is impossible for me to remember it very clearly.

The "Hu Feng counterrevolutionary clique" case was a major unjust case in literature and art circles after liberation: It had broad implications; it continued for a long period of time; it greatly shocked literature and art circles and society at large; and it brought great misfortune to those affected. As one of the participants in the Hu Feng case, I carry a certain amount of responsibility for which I also feel deeply regretful. Today, as we review the lessons of historical experience, the Hu Feng case is bound to be closely looked at by people everywhere.

In 1980, the Central Committee rehabilitated Hu Feng politically for the first time. In its announcement of Hu Feng's rehabilitation, the Central Committee noted that "the Hu Feng counterrevolutionary clique" case was a mixing up of two contradictions of different natures under the historical conditions of the time. The CPC Central Committee decided to rehabilitate some comrades deemed to be counterrevolutionary elements or members of a counterrevolutionary clique because of erroneous expressions of political views and factional activities." The notice also took responsibility for the Hu Feng case, saying that responsibility for the wrongful case that "created the so-called 'Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Clique' lay with the Central Committee." In June 1988, the Central Committee Office issued yet another notice further rehabilitating Hu Feng. The Central Committee's two rehabilitation decisions embody the party's spirit of seeking truth from facts and the need to correct errors. It also points out a clear direction for our correct summarization of the historical lessons of the Hu Feng case.

How did a difference of opinion in literature and art turn into a political issue about a contradiction between

ourselves and the enemy? This is a matter about which people today are most concerned. During the period when I took part in the criticism, that is exactly the process I went through; thus, I have an obligation to state clearly and fully the events about which I have knowledge by way of seeking truth from facts. Not only will this clarify some rumors and guesses that are not consistent with the facts, but will also help distill some lessons that should be learned from the historical facts.

II.

Question: The so-called "Hu Feng counterrevolutionary clique" case arose out of criticism of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art. Can you talk first about the origins of the differences in opinion about literature and art?

Answer: Criticism of Hu Feng's ideas about literature and art had undergone a very long process that went on from before liberation until after liberation. It was not a sudden chance occurrence. It had historical origins.

In 1942 in Chongqing, in his capacity as director of the All-China Writers and Artists Association and officer in charge of the research department, Hu Feng drafted a report titled, "The Development of Work in Literature and Art and the Direction of Our Efforts" for the sixth annual meeting of the association's board of directors. After reading it, Huang Yaomian [7806 5522 4177] wrote the word "questionable" on it in July of the same year. Huang felt that this article concealed theoretical gaps under a recondite title. He did not agree with Hu Feng's description of the nature of creative work during the early period of the War of Resistance Against Japan as being "manifested mostly in the simultaneous and separate developments of the subjective spirit and an unchecked objective spirit." He felt that this proposition was "a conclusion not derived from real life, but instead was an idea developed first and then later tacked onto an actual campaign."

Mao Dun did not agree with Hu Feng's ideas either. Later on, he recollected that "As early as the end of 1942, Hu Feng proposed his 'subjective fighting spirit.' He believed that various evidences of decline that had appeared in literary and artistic creative work were attributable largely to a decline in artists' subjective zeal, as well as to the objectivism and subjectivism in creative tendencies that this had created. He said, 'Some writers have adjusted themselves to circumstances in life and their enthusiasm has flagged. As a result, they have a passive attitude toward life and an indifferent attitude toward writing... This is the so-called objectivism that flagrantly marks literature today. Although their fighting zeal may have declined, writers are intellectually unable to put subjectivism aside, and because they wish to follow established practices, they pay attention to subjectivism in their content and subject matter by relying on theories and concepts. Thus, objectivism masquerades as a kind of subjectivism.' Hu Feng believed that the way to overcome such an attitude and trend in creative endeavors was to require writers to rouse their

'subjective fighting spirit.' He advocated a 'melding of subjective fighting spirit and objective truth,' and said that this was realism. At the time, Hu Feng's point of view did not arouse more interest because his analysis of the emotional frame of mind of the broad masses of progressive writers was extreme and unfair, and his conclusions were erroneous. His emphasis on the writer's individual will and his advocacy of a 'subjective fighting spirit' was not really taking the course of realism. Furthermore, he himself had never carried out the writer's 'self struggle' that he repeatedly talked about." (Excerpted from Mao Dun's "Reminiscences")

Nevertheless, Hu Feng stuck to his point of view throughout. The premiere issue of XIWANG [HOPE], which Hu Feng published in Chongqing in January 1945, carried Shu Wu's [5289 5617] feature article, "On Subjectivism." In a "postlogue," Hu Feng said, "This article raises 'an issue that may affect the Chinese people's struggle to find a new life.'" Actually, Shu Wu's article provided a theoretical foundation for Hu Feng's discussion of a "subjective fighting spirit." "On Subjectivism" and Hu Feng's "Committing Oneself to the Struggle For Democracy" attracted the attention of numerous comrades in Chongqing's party-led, progressive literature and art circles. At that time, I worked at the XINHUA RIBAO in Chongqing, where I was primarily in charge of relations with the newspaper's readers. I had no contact with Hu Feng and read very few of his articles. After publication of the premiere issue of XIWANG, some comrades in the newspaper who were engaged in work in literature and art got together to discuss the magazine. Their views were not entirely identical. I and some comrades did not approve of the undue emphasis in Shu Wu's article on the role of the subjective. We felt that such a viewpoint might lead to blind "leftist tendencies" in revolutionary work. In literary and artistic creation, it might lead people to become divorced from real life, and from the people. It merited discussion.

At that time, Comrade Zhou Enlai and the Chongqing Party organization regarded Hu Feng as a writer in the progressive camp. They were very solicitous about his magazine and his point of view. Thus on 25 January, a discussion group chaired by Feng Naichao [7458 0035 6389], an officer in charge of the party culture committee, and convened by the Literary Work Committee under Guo Moruo's leadership, discussed the XIWANG magazine article. Those attending the meeting included Mao Dun, Shao Quanlin [6730 5425 7792], Feng Xuefeng [7458 7185 1496], Cai Yi [5591 0308], Hu Feng, He Qifang [0149 0366 5364], Liu Baiyu [0491 4101 5038], and me. Mao Dun spoke first. He very much disapproved of "On Subjectivism," and criticized it. He maintained that the article's analysis of the situation among writers and artists in the area under Kuomintang-controlled areas during the War of Resistance Against Japan was not consistent with the facts. Mao Dun said angrily that the article was an enormous amount of verbiage that was actually "a hoax." After speaking, he left the meeting. Feng Xuefeng and others then said a few words, but the meeting did not continue.

In April 1945 in Chengdu, Huang Yaomian published "On Joseph's Coat," which criticized Shu Wu's "On Subjectivism" as "dressing up in Joseph's (meaning Stalin's) beautiful coat to stroll through a forest of errors, happy and pleased with oneself, and feeling very proud." Not only did Huang's article criticize the "subjective idealism in Shu Wu's article," it also criticized his "profundity," and deliberate affectation of a "highly abstruse" literary style.

During this period, He Qifang published letters "On Realism" and "On Objectivism," and debated with Wang Rong [3769 2051] and Lu Ying [0712 3576], who both supported Hu Feng's ideas. He Qifan maintained that "today this key issue about old literature and art in old China" is "basically an issue for the masses." He also dissented from the view that opposition to objectivism was the main task, pointing out that some of the writers who opposed "objectivism" were writers with progressive tendencies. Their criticism of people like Sha Ting [3097 3060] was criticism that did not between friend and foe.

In August 1945, the War of Resistance Against Japan was won. At the end of August, Chairman Mao went to Chongqing for talks with the Kuomintang, and Hu Qiaomu, who accompanied him, had talks with Hu Feng and Shu Wu, in which he criticized Shu Wu's views "On Subjectivism." Judging from the letter that Hu Feng wrote to Shu Wu, Hu strongly resented both the discussion that the party organization's literary work committee convened and Hu Qiaomu's criticism of "On Subjectivism." He called Mao Dun a "sordid merchant who was arrogant," and others "sordid merchants who took to their heels." He called Hu Qiaomu and other comrades "mandarins" and "lords." He also said, "My analysis was entirely correct... and the tenor of the postlogue was completely correct. It looks as if people either want to suffocate you, or to suffocate you and the magazine. The philosophers and the mandarins are the ones who intend the former, and the writers are the ones who intend the latter." "Now you must both write some essays and further research this problem so as to be ready to deal with it. ...You must work ceaselessly and unremittently!"

In Chongqing at that time a political struggle was waged for a peaceful and democratic government, and profound discussion on theoretical issues in literature and art was not possible. Consequently, different opinions on the views of Hu Feng and others were raised only within party-led progressive literary and art circles, rather than openly in society at large. This may be viewed as the first criticism of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art.

Mao Dun's article "Reflections," published in XIN WENXUE SHILIAO [NEW LITERATURE HISTORICAL DATA], (No 1, 1986) specifically talked about the controversy in Chongqing. Mao's article can help people think about the progressive literature and art circle in Chongqing at that time, as well as some comrades views of Hu Feng and "On Subjectivism." Excerpts follow:

"As a unique problem in literature and art theory, discussion of 'On Subjectivism' was necessary, although it was not conducive to the political struggle going on at the time for a democratic government. However, when one realizes that the so-called 'objectivists' or 'mechanistic dogmatists' that this theory spares no effort to rebuke are the writers who 'struggled arduously' in the darkest days of the War of Resistance Against Japan... the criticism is very unpalatable. At that time, a kind of behind-the-back 'commentary' was also circulated; for example, Sha Ting's 'Cornered Beasts' was called 'Birds and Beasts', and Zang Kejia's [5258 0344 1367] 'Affectionate Wild Horse' was called 'Sexy Emaciated Horse,' which was even more improper.

"After 'On Subjectivism' was published, no discussion appeared in newspapers and magazines. Views were exchanged only in some literature and art organizations. However, I found that any criticism of the views in that article evoked a retort from some people; it all had a rather strong partisan flavor. At that time, Hu Feng was a theoretical writer. Yet another theoretical writer, Feng Xuefeng, backed his views. Thus, before Yan'an literature and art theoreticians He Qifang and Li Mohan arrived in Chongqing, there were few people in Chongqing's literature and art theoretical circles. Huang Yaomian had written an article criticizing 'On Subjectivism,' but it was withdrawn by friends who explained that 'this article hampers the "writer" and the various literature and art magazines may find it awkward to publish.'

"It was also at that time that several good friends told me that the 'objectivism' that Hu Feng condemned referred to me and to Sha Ting. Supposedly Sha Ting and I were the arch criminals and chief culprits who had created the 'degenerate and reactionary trend in literature and art!' They spread this idea everywhere by word of mouth; because I did not see anything in print, I paid no heed. In any case, it was for the public to decide whether my writings were objectivist or not. Furthermore, I was busy at the time writing 'The Complete Story of Qing Ming.'

"It was not until the end of 1945, under instructions from Comrade Zhou Enlai, that the progressive literature and art circle in Chongqing met several times to more profoundly criticize Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art, and Shu Wu's 'On Subjectivism.' They also criticized Feng Xuefeng. I also spoke at the meetings. Nevertheless, Hu Feng did not learn anything from this. Feng Xuefeng changed after Zhou Enlai talked to him. He no longer praised Hu Feng's 'subjective fighting spirit,' but he was not thorough."

According to Liu Baiyu's recollections, a meeting that Zhou Enlai chaired was held in Zhou's residence at Zengjiayan. Participants included Mao Dun, Hu Feng, Xu Bing [1776 0393], Feng Naichao, and He Qifang. Once, discussions continued late into the night. No one was able to return home, so all they could do was squeeze into the living room to await daybreak. A place to sleep was made on the table only for Mao Dun.

III.

The second criticism of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art took place in Hong Kong during the liberation war.

Between September and October 1946, negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party broke down, and all-out civil war erupted. Acting in accordance with arrangements made by the party organization and Comrade Zhou Enlai, some comrades who were working on cultural and propaganda affairs made way separately to Hong Kong from Nanjing, Shanghai, and other places and prepared to continue propaganda and cultural work in Hong Kong. In October, I boarded a ship in Shanghai for Hong Kong. When the ship hoisted anchor, I stood on the side of the ship looking at the surging waters of the Huangpu Jiang. I remembered that this day (19 October) was the 10th anniversary of the death of Mr. Lu Xun, and I had to sigh. On the ship, I ran into Qiao Guanhua [0829 0385 5478] by chance. In order to avoid coming to the notice of enemies, we boarded ship separately. We strolled along the deck chatting, and talked about Hu Feng's and other people's views on literature and art. While in Chongqing, Qiao Guanhua had written a rather influential article under the pen name Yu Chao [0060 3390], titled "While Fang Sheng Lay Dying." Some of the views in the article were rather close to Hu Feng's views. For example, he did not think it important for intellectuals and working people to join together. He felt that the intellectuals' weaknesses were too many thoughts and too few feelings (meaning too much revolutionary theory and too little emotional arousal), etc. These views had been criticized by some comrades in the party. However in this conversation, Qiao Guanhua's view of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art had changed very greatly. At that time, he was reading a novel titled *Starving Guo Su'e* written by Lu Ling [6424 5044], the writer that Hu Feng praised most. He felt that the novel was divorced from reality, that the characters were unrealistic, and that the protagonist did not resemble a real worker. As a result, he began to question Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art.

After reaching Hong Kong, I helped Zhang Hanfu [4545 3352 1133] edit QUNZHONG ZHOUKAN [MASSES WEEKLY]. This was a publication that covered politics, current affairs, and culture. Literature and art work was under the leadership of the party culture committee, with Feng Naichao in charge. "A Collection of Art and Literature for the Masses" was published under the leadership of the culture committee. It was edited by Shao Quanlin. During the intense fighting in the people's liberation war, just on the eve of national liberation, comrades in the Hong Kong culture committee felt that a review of past work in literature and art was needed, as well as a look at future work. After an exchange of views, Quanlin wrote an article titled "Views on the Current Literature and Art Movement," which was published in the first issue of "A Collection of Art and Literature for the Masses." The article began with a self-criticism, saying that previous work in literature and art had

gradually neglected a consistent mass standpoint toward the new literature and art movement, and had tended to neglect the duty of ideological self-remolding. The article also criticized the thinking of Hu Feng and others on literature and art, which was one of several trends in progressive literature and art at the time. Quanlin noted that "with regard to naturalist tendencies, they tended toward a so-called pursuit of a subjective spirit. They believe that the decline in creativity resulted from a decline in the writers' zeal, a withering of vitality, and a lack of inquiry into the objective that plagued the subjective spirit. Thus, they called for a strengthening of such spirit, emphasized the vitality of literature and art, as well as the moral force of writers as individuals, and stressed the pursuit of the spiritual world inherent in creative work. This recommendation had been prompted by the feeble content of most works at the time. In reality, however, they still strongly manifested an individualistic mentality that did not look at problems in terms of class or socioeconomic reasons, but proceeded instead from an individual basis. This kind of thinking did not proceed from the relationship between literature and art, and society, but rather viewed problems from the relationship between literature and art, and the writer as an individual. They also did not understand that the revolutionary's subjective fighting force was tempered through actual revolutionary struggle, and that his revolutionary character was founded on his unity with class forces. On the contrary, they have turned the problem upside down. They view the individual subjective spirit as having an independent, *a priori* existence; as existing separately from history and society; and as something that transcends class. Consequently, they see it as a force that creates and conquers all. This was, above all, a departure from the principle of historical materialism."

Quanlin went on to say, "Proceeding from such a basis, they naturally drifted toward emphasizing the self, rejecting the collective, negating the significance of thought, declaring the extinction of the ideological system, obliterating the party and class nature of literature and art, and opposing the direct political effect of literature and art. In their creative endeavors, they naturally tended to pursue an individual, subjective realm, or a spiritual world unique to the individual. Although their abstract theory stressed the need for struggle and subjective strength, they in fact advocated a detachment from reality and development in the direction of individualism in art. They advocated that literature and art depart from the principles of historical struggle and urged the use of an unprincipled, spontaneous spirit in place of serious and earnest thought. Therefore, this position not only could not reinforce subjective strength, it was only enough to weaken subjective strength. Actually, it was also a trend toward the development of idealism."

In the second issue of "A Collection of Art and Literature for the Masses," Qiao Guanhua published an article titled "Literary and Artistic Creation and Subjectivity,"

in which he first criticized his own thesis in "While Fang Sheng Lay Dying." He said, "During the early years of the War of Resistance Against Japan, for example, the following such argument appeared: Life is everywhere, both in the front lines and in the rear. The crux of the current problem is not whether there is life in the front lines or in the rear, but in the attitude toward life." "This idea seemed to have been raised to address with how intellectuals could unite with the people, but it actually undermined the basic proposition of a linkage with the people."

On the relationship between the writer's subjectivity in literary and artistic creation, and objective reality, Qiao Guanhua believed that "the content of literary and artistic works is a reflection of objective reality, but is not a reproduction of objective reality. What it expresses must be a little 'more' and a little 'higher' than objective reality. It is good to raise this issue. However, at present (meaning in areas under the control of Chiang Kai-shek at the end of the War of Resistance Against Japan), the main weakness of New China's literature and art is not that it reflects the realities of the Chinese revolution too objectively, but that it does not even try to reflect this reality. Even when it tries, literature and art does not reflect objective reality too objectively, but rather too subjectively. People use petty bourgeois subjectivism, which they suppose is revolutionary, to smear, distort, and falsify the masses' consciousness and the objective facts of their struggle. They portray real-life and dynamic people as insensitive and inhumane, and ascribe the aspirations and struggles of the petty bourgeoisie to the 'minds' of the working masses. In essence, isn't this nothing but a manifestation of the subjectivism of the petty bourgeoisie?"

In his "Review of Lu Ling's Short Stories," Hu Sheng [5170 4939] pointed out that these disastrous consequences result from an undue emphasis on the subjective spirit and neglect of the realities of objective life in creative writing: "I would like to say that this writer, who is said to be the least contaminated with 'objectivist tendencies,' actually has too much of the subjectivism of intellectuals. His overly strong subjectivism prevents him from conscientiously depicting the workers that he sees, and makes him explore the workers' 'spiritual world' through conjecture to the point that he even portrays workers, on whom he seemingly pins his hopes, as nervous, emotionally unpredictable people, like some intellectuals. The thoughts and feelings in the 'spiritual world' of the workers, as he described them, were incompatible with the lives of the real workers, with the result that readers find his work strange and incomprehensible." Why does this happen? "One simple explanation is that the writer does not really understand workers, yet is not content to just describe their outward appearance, but wants to depict them a little 'deeper,' with the result that he can only fill in his descriptions with all the things that he understands about intellectuals."

It was no wonder that Qiao Guanhua, whose views were sometimes fairly close to Hu Feng's, also began to

question Hu's thinking after reading the works of Lu Ling, who was rather profoundly influenced by Hu Feng. Qiao Guanhua had studied philosophy in Germany. In his aforementioned article, he also cited Hegel's "Aesthetics" to explain the relationship between the subjectivism of writers and the objective counterparts they portray. Qiao Guanhua said:

One idealist who emphasized the objective had these words that were even more materialistic than we materialists who stress the subjective:

If one asks what the "creative imperative" of artists is, one might say that it is none other than for the writer to completely immerse himself in his objective subject matter until he can use artistic means to express it.

For this to happen, the writer must transform the objective subject into a thing of his own. He must completely abandon his subjective individuality and occasional idiosyncrasy and completely immerse himself in the objective subject matter. Thus, the subjective writer is nothing more than a means or tool for molding objective substance.

If a writer defines "creative imperative" to mean that his subjectivism is only his own, and forgets that the writer's subjectivism is an apparatus and tool through which objective substance is reflected and further elaborated, then this kind of writer's "creative imperative" is bound to be a bad creative imperative.

My reason for quoting such a long passage is that the words of this famous idealist philosopher are closer to human feelings and less confusing than the words of some of our "aesthetes" and "theoreticians," who are deliberately mystifying.

The more the subjective spirit of these subjectivists "grows" and "kindles," the more divorced the subjectivists become from the people, and the more they despise the masses. Thus, under the motto of "individual freedom," they openly call for an "escape from the collective." (See the article by Shu Wu in the premiere issue of HUXI [BREATHING].) I denounced this view of theirs in an article I published in Hong Kong's WEN WEI PO at that time titled "Individual Emancipation and Collectivism." I said: "These writers are the bankrupt, children of aristocrats falling behind in life. They are unhappy with the fact that they cannot live 'prosperous lives.' Nevertheless they display the self-pity and self-love of scholars. Their thinking is 'I am this wonderful, unique, and one-of-kind, yet am not allowed to live as I please.' They fantasize that they are heroes, and view the masses as backward and ignorant things whose bodies are covered with scars (in their words, full of the 'wounds of spiritual slavery'). Consequently, they want to 'escape from the collective' and 'seek isolation'."

What I just described outlines several of the main issues of contention that we had with Hu Feng and his followers during the Hong Kong period. We have to say that the airing and clarification of these issues by the progressive literature and art camp, undertaken to better

unify action and improve the ability to fight back, was an event of great importance at a time of life-and-death struggle between the forces of light and darkness on the eve of new China's difficult birth, when all kinds of ideological weapons were urgently needed to help hasten that birth. The premise of these articles was still to form "a united front to carry out ideological struggle in the expectation that it would bring about greater ideological unity in literature and art" (Quan Lin). The tone was also serious.

"A Collection of Art and Literature for the Masses" was also distributed on the mainland where it attracted the attention of people in literary and art circles in Shanghai and Beijing, and incited quite a response. However, "according to the reaction of subjectivists, the work was an unprincipled slander and abuse against 'mud' and 'song'." (Quan Lin)

This was the second criticism of the Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art and the first public criticism.

Because of the adverse circumstances in Shanghai and other places at the time, the party was worried about the safety of friends there such as Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, and other progressive writers, and made arrangements for them to travel to Hong Kong. One of them was Hu Feng. Hu Feng, however, believed that it was an attempt by party member writers to "force" him to go to Hong Kong for a debate. In a letter to Shu Wu on 26 October 1948, he wrote: "The importance of today's struggle has been greatly elevated, and the adversary is also especially abominable... It appears that they have employed all sorts of despicable methods (including arbitrary decisions in written propaganda) to resist and counterattack, while also thinking of every possible means to force me to go 'talk it over,' in an effort to gain an advantageous truce... Since we are at a disadvantage, we must be particularly careful and not underestimate the enemy..." "We have to loosen 20 years of mechanical rule, so we must work harder..." "The weapon they are using now is to 'invite' me to leave at once, and it is the final move of the feudal princes. Now I am under the double pressure of being forced to move and being asked to move."

In 1949, Beijing was liberated. The comrades and friends in Hong Kong left one after another. Hu Feng also returned to Beijing by arrangement of the party organization to take part in the first National Congress of Literature and Art Workers.

IV.

The first National Congress of Literature and Art workers was held on 21 July 1949. This was a grand victorious gathering of literature and art workers from both liberated areas and from areas under Kuomintang rule. This was a historical meeting convened at the greater historical turning point period when the three big mountains were toppled and a new people's regime was established. It set forth for the broad masses of literary and artistic workers the great historical task of a literary and artistic orientation that adhered to Mao Zedong's

new democracy, forging close links with the working people, becoming thoroughly familiar with the new masses, portraying a new life, and struggling to build a new China. I was also a congress delegate, but since I was unable to leave work in Hong Kong, I was unable to return to take part.

At this congress, Zhou Enlai made a political report; Guo Moruo made an important speech; Mao Dun made a report on the subject of "Struggle Under Reactionary Oppression and the Development of Revolutionary Literature and Art"; and Zhou Yang [0719 2254] made a report sketching the literature and art movement in liberated areas. The third part of Mao Dun's report on "the development of literature and art ideological theory" specifically criticized the literary and artistic thinking of Hu Feng without mentioning his name. It said that "'subjective' problems in literature and art are actually problems having to do with the writer's standpoint, viewpoint, and attitude." He said as follows:

"In 1944 or thereabouts, an ideological trend emerged in Chongqing that emphasized 'vitality,' which was actually an expression of the petty bourgeoisie's inability to bear a long period of darkness and a harsh life. Unable to bear the suffering of real life, the petty bourgeoisie expressed negative and downcast feelings on the one hand, while also showing an impetuous catch-up psychology. Both trends showed up in creative literary and artistic works. Subsequently, a tendency was particularly manifested in literature and art theory that shaped a 'petty bourgeois revolutionary' literature and art theory. Although this literature and art theory severely attacked the former negative and downcast tendency, it could not make a positive contribution to the solution of ideological problems. It could only one-sidedly and abstractly demand a strengthening of 'subjectivism'.

"As a result, problems having to do with literary and artistic 'subjectivism' have become cumulative and festering problems during the past several years in the literary and artistic ideology of areas under Kuomintang rule. A solution must be found.

"The essence of the problem is as follows: Literary and artistic workers naturally are unable to adopt a 'purely objective' attitude to deal with life, but the reason for the various deviations that have taken shape in literature and art stem, in the final analysis, from writers' attitudes being too subjective, or is it because writers too much take the subjective standpoint of the petty bourgeoisie? If the petty bourgeois ideological outlook and sentiment is in fact becoming a fundamental factor that prevents our writers from identifying with the ideology and feelings of the broad masses of people, then solution to the problem must not be to demand 'more' subjectivism from the writers. This is not a matter of strong or weak subjectivism, much less is it an issue of the flagging of subjective zeal or exerting oneself. It is not an issue of whether force of character is great or insignificant, but an issue of writers' standpoint. It is an issue of how thoroughly

writers abandon the subjective standpoint of the petty bourgeoisie, and truly link up with the masses of people in ideology and life.

"Is it possible under reactionary Kuomintang rule to raise the standpoint issue? Without doubt, it can be done and must be done. Under such an environment in which progressive writers are linked spiritually in theory and practice, study of the theory of Chinese social and revolutionary policies, and setting one's own creative orientation is possible. Furthermore, it is linked to a certain extent to the real struggle of the popular masses. Learning from the people, the lives and struggles of the people thereby becoming a fountainhead for one's own creative works, is also possible. However, some people suppose that the study of revolutionary theory is enough to make writers 'lie'. They suppose that only by bringing into play writers' 'subjectivism' can art be truly expressed. They suppose that since a writer is revolutionary, he naturally holds a revolutionary standpoint, and if he does not have a revolutionary standpoint to begin with, any effort at studying and remolding is wasted. They suppose that writers will 'fight' according to the kind of life they live. When writers' freedom was completely taken away under the Kuomintang regime, such a formulation was not entirely unfounded; however, on this account they also ignored the need for writers to be linked to the real struggles of the masses. They emphasized the drawbacks that a feudal system creates for the people, supposing that a struggle against the drawbacks imposed on the people is the primary duty of any writer, while also unconditionally worshipping the spontaneous struggle for individualism. They suppose that this struggle is a manifestation of a healthy primitive vitality. It is not conscious struggle for collectivism but rather this so-called primitive vitality that they regard as the powerhouse of history. They wish to rely on abstract vitality and the spontaneous emergence of individuals to oppose realism; thus, this is actually a petty bourgeois illusion dissociated from the life of the masses.

"Therefore, any further discussion of the issue of 'subjectivism' has to come back to the writer's standpoint, outlook, and attitudes issues that Mao Zedong raised in his 'Talks on Literature and Art'.

"If writers cannot truly rid their ideology and their daily life of the petty bourgeois standpoint and adopt the standpoint of workers, peasants and soldiers, and the standpoint of the masses, the problem of producing literature and art of a mass character cannot be completely solved, and the issue of the strength and weakness, and the health or lack of health of writers' subjectivism can certainly not be solved either. Only one conclusion and no other conclusion can be drawn from the struggle over ideology and theory in literature and art in the areas under Kuomintang control in the same way as in creative practice."

This was the third criticism of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art, and it was the first criticism since liberation of the whole country. No names were mentioned, however. Naturally, Hu Feng was extremely

displeased. Hu Feng was supposed to have been a member who drafted the report, but in the course of drafting the report, "Hu Feng firmly declined and did not take part."

V.

In November 1951, the Standing Committee of the All-China Federation of Literary and Art Circles [hereafter, ACFLAC] decided to conduct a rectification of literature and art in response to Chairman Mao's call for "self-education and self-transformation." In the course of the rectification, some readers' letters to WENYI BAO [LITERATURE AND ART PRESS] proposed a criticism of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art. The WENYI BAO "Internal Correspondence" carried these letters.

In April 1952, Zhou Yang went to Shanghai. On the recommendation of Peng Boshan [1756 0130 1472], deputy director of the Shanghai Municipal CPC Committee's Cultural Department, Zhou Yang had a talk with Hu Feng. Hu Feng provided the following account of this talk in his "300,000-word report" to the Central Committee:

"In his talk with me in Shanghai, Comrade Zhou Yang reprimanded me for 'regarding the Party abstractly,' seriously condemning my individualist heroism. He said that I had criticized Party writers to the 'nth degree,' but he also criticized me for close relations with the Chongqing 'gifted scholars clique' (meaning Qiao Guanhua and other comrades). However, his purpose was that I return to Beijing for discussions, or to make arrangements for to go to Beijing for a chat. ...After Comrade Zhou Yang left, Comrade Peng Bingshan [1756 0393 1472] (meaning Peng Boshan) felt that to continue this way would not do. He suggested that I write a letter to Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou in which I made a report and requested instructions. I thought this over for two days, and although I felt mentally upset, I felt that the methods that WENYI BAO used resulted in waste and turmoil, so I boldly wrote the letter."

On 4 May, Hu Feng wrote a letter to Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou to which he attached the WENYI BAO "Internal Correspondence" letters to the editor demanding an open criticism of Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art.

The day 23 May 1952 was the tenth anniversary of the publication of Mao Zedong's "Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art." In accordance with the decision of the CPC Central Committee Propaganda Department, I wrote a commemorative editorial for RENMIN RIBAO titled "Continue to Struggle For the Orientation in Literature and Art That Comrade Mao Zedong Proposed." The editorial further stressed the importance of implementing "the Talks." At the same time it pointed out that "the ideological tumult currently existing in the world of literature and art is manifested largely in the following two regards: First, and most important, is the corrosion of revolutionary art and

literature by bourgeois ideology... Second, and seemingly the reverse of the aforementioned tendency but actually also a departure from the masses and life, is a tendency toward formalism and abstract generalization in creative literary and artistic words." I cannot remember the reasons that neither Zhou Yang nor Hu Qiaomu did not read this draft, but rather sent it directly to Liu Shaoqi for his review. He agreed to its publication. Following publication, Quanlin told me that Hu Feng also expressed approval of the formulation that two tendencies existed. Later on I learned that he said the following in a letter to Lu Ling: "I read the commemorative editorial, and I seem also to have seen problems. The intention to murder still exists, but there is no desire to make it too obvious just now!"

On 25 May, the Wuhan CHANGJIANG RIBAO published Shu Wu's article titled, "Study Anew 'The Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art'." The article presented a criticism in terms of "the Talks." It presented Shu Wu's own ideological situation around the time of liberation in an examination of his own past mistaken ideology, and it criticized Lu Ying and Lu Ling by name. It "hoped that Lu Ying, Lu Ling, and several other people would hurriedly leave the study, the rostrum, and the creation studios to plunge into the real struggles of the masses, first of all understanding this document's (meaning 'the Talks') minimum requirements for their own creative works, further mastering this weapon."

The publication of Shu Wu's article attracted the attention of Comrade Hu Qiaomu. He believed it could be replayed in RENMIN RIBAO. On 8 June, RENMIN RIBAO replayed the article, along with an editor's note that Hu Qiaomu wrote as follows:

"This article originally appeared in the 25 May issue of CHANGJIANG RIBAO. The treatise titled 'On Subjectivism' to which the writer refers here was published in the Chongqing magazine XIWANG in 1945. This magazine was published by a small literary and art group that Hu Feng headed. In their creative literary and artistic works, they unduly exaggerated the role of subjective spirit, and sought expansion of so-called vitality, which was actually a denial of the significance of revolutionary practice and ideological remolding. This was a thesis that actually belonged to bourgeois and petty bourgeois individualist ideology on literature and art. The article that appears below presents Shu Wu's criticism of his formerly erroneous ideology, which deserves to be welcomed."

Publication of Shu Wu's article caused a very great shock to Hu Feng and among those close to him. Hu Feng, who held Shu Wu in extremely high regard, and who believed that "On Subjectivism" raised a "question that would adversely affect the struggle of the Chinese people for a new life," began to spurn Shu Wu. In letters to friends, he nicknamed Shu Wu "Wu Chi" [meaning shameless] and "Wu Chih" [meaning we quit]. In a letter to Lu Ling, he said, "As for Shameless (meaning Shu Wu), I definitely want you to make a statement, naturally one that

exposes him. Moreover, that article (meaning 'On Subjectivism') cannot be taken as a definitive view, but rather as a discussion (as you heard at the time). Furthermore, no one completely agreed with him at the time. Exposing him will serve as a lesson, it is hoped. Liu Deng's large contingent did not take part, and afterward everyone was unhappy with him. After liberation, he was urged at Nanning. He always wanted to emerge and climb upward, but when he had nothing to say in Beijing except freezing irony, everyone detested him..."

The letter that Hu Feng wrote to Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou on 4 May, Zhou Yang read. On 23 July, Zhou Yang wrote a letter to the premier that discussed the Hu Feng problem. In the letter, he said:

Premier:

Comrade Han Sheng [5060 4563] let me read the letter that Hu Feng wrote to you and the chairman. The letter mentioned my talk with him in Shanghai. I feel that he seems to have deliberately misinterpreted what I said (possibly because of his sensitive nature). He basely interpreted a controversy over theoretical principles as an unprincipled personnel problem.

Now, I am making a report of what transpired in my talk with him in Shanghai, and my views on handling his problem as follows:

I reached Shanghai in late April. Comrade Peng Boshan (presently deputy director of the Huadong Cultural Department, who formerly had quite good relations with Hu Feng) told me that Hu Feng knew of my arrival, and very much wanted to see me. Boshan and I personally went to his home where we dined and talked for three hours. I noted that politically he had always taken the side of the party, that he had done quite a bit of work on literary and artistic matters, and that he also had a conscientious work attitude; however, his theories on literature and art were mistaken. Most important was the undue emphasis on the so-called "subjective spirit," which was actually a rejection of the idea of petty bourgeois intellectual writers actually struggling among the worker and peasant masses to remold themselves. On this basic point, his theories ran directly counter to Chairman Mao's thinking on literature and art. In addition, I pointed out that his literature and art theory completely undervalued his own national tradition. He excitedly showed me some internal correspondence and editor's notes from WENYI BAO. He considered such actions on the part of WENYI BAO unreasonable. I said that since I had not been in Beijing for a period of time, I had not read these notes, but I felt that these notes were correct. He also spoke about how you had talked to him about the problem of his lack of cooperation with other people. He said that he had always cooperated with us. I said that the facts were otherwise. I will not talk about past relations between the two of us; this was an old matter of nearly 20 years ago. On this matter, I must bear greater responsibility as a member of the party. I mentioned only two controversies about literature and art as follows: One was

the controversy in 1940 or thereabouts about the national forms. He referred to Communist Party writers in the same breath as Xiang Linbing [0686 2651 0393], who was suspected of Kuomintang connections, firing from every angle. Moreover, his entire point of view opposed national forms. The second time was during the 1947 - 1948 controversy about the "subjectivism issue." Not only did he not very well consider the criticisms of him that Communist Party writers made (these writers used to be rather close to him), but on the contrary, he adopted an abusive attitude toward this well-intentioned criticism. On the basis of these two facts, I explained that not only was he theoretically mistaken, but that his attitude was also not sufficiently cooperative. (Note: a sentence in the reproduction of this document is unclear.) The entire content of my talk with him in Shanghai was as I have said.

When the rectification of literature and art began in Shanghai, Comrade Xia Yan [1115 5888] asked me what to do about Hu Feng. I wrote letters to comrades Xia Yan and Boshan suggesting active efforts to get him into political study and to criticize leadership after which proper methods could be used to conduct a criticism of his thinking on literature and art in order to help him do a self-examination. During the rectification, he wrote an article in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art, which made no criticism whatsoever of his own thinking on literature and art. This article was not published in Shanghai. Shanghai found it difficult to criticize Hu Feng's theory, and did not do it. At the same time, the Beijing RENMIN RIBAO published Shu Wu's self-criticism article. Reportedly, the issue of Hu Feng's theoretical areas had been formally raised. Recently WENYI BAO published two letters about Hu Feng's ideology that more urgently called upon Hu Feng to come to Beijing, but this criticism work was done only by Beijing. He (meaning Hu Feng) went to Beijing on the 19th [further date not given] where he lived in the Ministry of Culture. I have already talked with him on one occasion, saying that I hoped that he would be able to take an attitude of objective criticism regarding his past theories. We are prepared to have the CPC Committee Central Committee Propaganda Departments convene a small number of literature and art cadres from within the party to discuss Hu Feng's theories. Lin Mohan is to be designated the principal spokesman (a task for which he is preparing), and comrades Xue Feng and Ding Ling are prepared to express views. Once there is a unanimity of opinion within the party, a small literature and art forum to discuss Hu Feng's theories is to be convened. (I have already told him to prepare. I surmise that his self-criticism will not be very good); then everyone can express opinions and conduct a debate. One or two of the articles criticized can be selected for publication. If his statement contains a fairly good self-criticism, it can be published too. We are trying to get him to change and remold his own errors.

Please advise whether the above views are satisfactory.

With Greetings,

Zhou Yang

23 July

On 27 July 7, Comrade Zhou Enlai made the following notation on Comrade Zhou Yang's envelope:

Comrade Zhou Yang:

I agree with the steps you have proposed for the self-examination of Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art. You might add Hu Sheng and He Qifang to those taking part. These two have already criticized Hu Feng. Do not hope to be able to obtain results the first time. However, since he can and must conclude his restless ideological life of the past 20 years, you must diligently help him do the initial work of exposing and criticizing. If it does not work the first time, try again. Once begun, it must be carried through to the end. If a small number of people are not successful, appeal to readers to wage a criticism struggle with him. Empty talk is of no use; you'll have to put him into the daily life and work of the masses for remodeling. Try out everything, and you will have results.

Zhou Enlai

27 October

On the same day, Zhou Enlai sent another letter to Hu Feng as follows:

Comrade Hu Feng:

I have received and read the letter and attachments you sent me on 4 May. Now I know that you are in Beijing, but I am busy and unable to meet with you for a chat just now. I hope that you will contact comrades Zhou Yang and Ding Ling first. If you can make a self-criticism of your ideology on literature and art and your attitude in life, that would be first rate, and could, as you say, conclude the "restlessness" of the past 20 years.

I especially read Shu Wu's self-criticism article once, and I hope that you will read it carefully several times.

I have forwarded your letter to Chairman Mao.

With best wishes,

Zhou Enlai

27 July

The contents of the above letters show, first, that it cannot be denied that historically there had been some contradictions and controversies between Zhou Yang and Hu Feng; nevertheless, Zhou Yang's criticism of Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art was not brought about by personal animosity as some people said, but rather by the longstanding divergence and dispute about ideology regarding literature and art. Furthermore, these struggles were conducted under leadership of the party from beginning to end. The methods that Comrade Zhou

Yang used to criticize Hu Feng's ideology about literature and art were approved by the CPC Central Committee following requests for instructions. Second, Premier Zhou was extremely solicitous about Hu Feng, but his concern was principled. First of all, it was a political concern for Hu Feng, and second, it was concern about this ideology regarding literature and art. It was not, as some imagined, seeming not to have a view as to the rights and wrongs of Hu Feng's ideological outlook.

On the basis of Premier Zhou's instructions, on 6 September 1952, the CPC Central Committee Propaganda Department held four discussion meetings at Comrade Ding Ling's home in Dongzongbu Hutong. By way of informing people about the basis circumstances of the meetings, I would like to quote pertinent portions of "Report on Events Pertaining to Criticism of Hu Feng's Ideology Regarding Literature and Art," which the CPC Central Committee Propaganda Department sent to Premier Zhou and the CPC Central Committee on 15 February 1953:

"We held four discussion meeting with Hu Feng. Participants other than Hu Feng and Shu Wu, who formerly belonged to Hu Feng's small clique, were Zhou Yang, Feng Xuefeng, Ding Ling, Hu Sheng, Zhang Tianji, Shao Quanlin, He Qifang, Li Mohan, Yan Wenjing, Wang Chaowen, Tian Jian, Chen Qixia, and Qi Qing—a total of more than 10 people. The first meeting was devoted mostly to everyone raising questions as reference for Hu Feng's self-criticism. At the second meeting, Hu Feng used the questions that everyone had raised as a basis for making a statement of self-criticism. Shu Wu also made a self-criticism at this meeting. During the third and fourth meetings, everyone expressed views about Hu Feng's ideology regarding literature and art, with Hu Feng finally expressing his attitude toward the views everyone expressed. In addition to these discussion meetings, quite a few comrades also had one or more special talks with Hu Feng. During both the discussion meetings and separate conversations, we adopted a sincere and frank attitude, solemnly and specifically pointing out wherein the errors in his ideology about literature and art lay and the nature of his errors. However, Hu Feng made only some self-examination of his abnormal relations with the party, but he never made any self-criticism of the errors in principle in his ideology about literature and art. On the contrary, he devoted extremely great effort to defending himself. He still intends to show that he has been right all along, although his attitude is somewhat better than formerly. He expressed orally his willingness to consider everyone's criticism.

"Lu Ling, who had been most profoundly influenced by Hu Feng's ideology, said nothing at the discussion meetings. Following the meetings, Comrade Lin Mohan had a chat with him. Lu Ling said that he now has a preliminary understanding of the error of Hu Feng's ideology regarding literature and art. He said that he wants to remold himself through practice.

"The main errors in Hu Feng's ideology about literature and art are as follows: (1) He overlooks the roles of world view and class standpoint, substituting old realities for socialist realities, which is actually to substitute bourgeois and petty bourgeois literature and art for proletarian literature and art. (2) He emphasizes abstract 'subjective fighting spirit,' denying that bourgeois writers must remold their ideology and change their standpoint. He places undue emphasis on intellectual writers as a vanguard among the people, and he has extreme disdain for working people, particularly the peasants. (3) He worships West European bourgeois literature and art, disdaining the national literary and artistic heritage. This is completely contrary to Marxist ideology about literature and art. Such an ideology is very congenial for most workers in literature and the arts who have a bourgeois background. In order to eradicate the effects of this ideology on Hu Feng and those like Hu Feng, it was decided that comrades Lin Mohan and He Qifang write articles of open criticism. Lin Mohan's article has already been published in this year's second issue of WENYI BAO, and reprinted in RENMIN RIBAO. He Qifang's article will soon be published as well. In addition, responsible cadres in the world of literature and art have been convened to report what transpired in the criticism of Hu Feng's ideology regarding literature and art, and the essence of mistakes in Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art.

"As to Hu Feng's work assignment, he himself would like to work on the WENYI BAO editorial committee. We feel that until such time as he thoroughly understands and criticizes his own erroneous ideology, he is not suited to serve on the editorial committee of such a critical literary and artistic publication. We have urged him to immerse himself in real life, then devote himself either to creative work or to university teaching in the future. He is not agreeable. Now, we have decided that he should work in the ACFLAC, and consider suitable work later on (to work either in the creative work committee of the ACFLAC, or to do editorial work at RENMIN WENXUE [PEOPLE'S LITERATURE]). He himself has agreed, and he is now planning to bring his family from Shanghai to Beijing."

On 5 March, Premier Zhou made the following notation on this report:

"Policy and attitude toward Hu Feng is correct. Have notified Propaganda Department of need to persevere. Continue serious, just, and profound open criticism of his ideological style and works, but give him work to do. Urge him to go to the front lines, or to a factory, or into a rural village to temper himself and learn through experience, and we'll see how he behaves."

Premier Zhou's notation as well as the Central Committee Propaganda Department's report were sent to Chairman Mao and Liu Shaoqi.

The criticism article that I published in WENYI BAO titled "The Anti-Marxist Literary and Artistic Ideology of Hu Feng" was collated from my remarks made at the discussion meeting on Hu Feng's Ideology Regarding

Literature and Art that the Central Committee Propaganda Department convened. It was reprinted in the 30 January 1953 RENMIN RIBAO. At the beginning of the article, I first noted as follows:

"Before criticizing Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art, it should first be explained that Hu Feng engaged in literary and artistic activities for a long time in areas under Kuomintang control. Politically, he is a progressive, who struggled against Kuomintang fascist culture. Hu Feng made a contribution in this regard. His ideology on literature and art is also not completely wrong. On certain individual issues, it contains correct components. Nevertheless, correct views on individual issues cannot change the essential error of his ideology on literature and art." (Note: emphasis added)

In the article, I particularly criticized Hu Feng for adopting a nonclass point of view in dealing with literary and artistic problems, because an erroneous point of view existed in the way in which he dealt with realism problems, problems having to do with the ideological remolding of workers in literature and art, problems probing real life, and the way of looking at the May 4th literature and art movement. It pointed out:

"The source of Hu Feng's ideological errors regarding literature and art lay in his having always taken a nonclass point of view in dealing with problems in literature and art. He does not examine the class origins of various literary and artistic phenomena, but rather departs from class relationships in seeking reasons for literary and artistic phenomena. However, departure from a class point of view in a class society makes it impossible to avoid falling into error.

"This mistake of Hu Feng shows up clearly in his way of looking at realism. ...In his theory, there is no fundamental distinction between the old realism and socialist realism. In What is the fundamental issue in realism in Hu Feng's view? It is that he persists in advocating so-called writers' 'subjective fighting spirit' and the linking of this 'subjective fighting spirit' with objective reality. In his view, whether a writer's 'subjective fighting spirit' is strong or weak, existent or non-existent is the mark of whether realism is strong or weak, existent or non-existent. In this, Hu Feng first of all unduly and improperly emphasizes so-called 'subjective fighting spirit' without emphasizing the more important loyalty to realism. This is fundamentally anti-realistic. Second, Hu Feng's so-called 'subjective fighting spirit' is an abstract thing lacking in class content; thus, what he terms realism is an abstract thing lacking in class content. However, this kind of realism actually does not exist. In a class society, all realism has its class character. When one departs from the class viewpoint and departs from realism in the specific historical character of any era, one is bound to be unable to understand realism correctly. The basic issue in realism is decidedly not the abstract 'subjective fighting spirit' that Hu Feng talks about. This is because every writer has his own nature and a certain degree of 'subjective fighting spirit,' however, this 'subjective fighting

spirit' is determined primarily by his class standpoint. Being able to look at squarely and criticize the reality of the time, exposing the shortcomings and ugliness of the bourgeoisie, the old realism, such as the realism being criticized, has a very great progressive role. However, its reflection of reality and its criticism of reality is affected by the limitations of the class standpoint and the world view on which it relies. Consequently, it cannot fully reflect the struggle of the working class and working people. Clearly, this is no matter of the writer's 'subjective fighting spirit,' but rather a matter of the writer's class standpoint first of all. Likewise, with regard to a socialist realist, the fundamental issue is also not having or not having an abstract 'subjective fighting spirit,' but rather it is primarily whether one has a working class standpoint and a communist world view. Without such a standpoint and world view, no matter how strong your 'subjective fighting spirit,' one cannot correctly and fully reflect today's realities. Hu Feng's error was in departing from the class point of view all along. He was unable to see the class character of various different kinds of reality. Consequently, he was also unable to see the fundamental difference between the old realism and socialist realism."

My reason for excerpting this passage from the critical article of that time is Hu Feng's subsequent distortion of my original meaning in his "300,000-Word Report." Quoting out of context, he conducted a refutation of the sentence, "One must first have a working class standpoint and a communist world view," deeming it to be an "a priori concept." "Because mechanism (idealism) forsakes understanding of practice, it makes world view into an inflexible thing that is accomplished once. It stifles artistic practice and abolishes art itself." He even characterized this sentence as meaning that "any 'faultless' real Marxist who does not first attain to this world view is incapable of realistic creative practice." Actually, it is not difficult to see from the context that what I said here was the difference between socialist realism and old realism or the criticism of realism. Since socialist realism requires that the realism of artistic portrayals must be related to the task of educating the people in the socialist spirit, socialist realism must hold a progressive world view and a socialist consciousness. This is just the main difference between socialist realism writers and old realists, or those who criticize realism. This is completely at variance with Hu Feng's statement that "according to Lin Mohan's views that unless one first has a working class standpoint and a communist world view," one cannot produce creative works. As for staying that I advocate an "a priori" communist world view, that is sheer nonsense. We have always maintained the need to study Marxism and to temper ourselves through practice in the masses' struggle as a means of gaining a correct world view. This is positively unlike the simply close the door and "kindle oneself," and "expand oneself" and then be able to succeed that Hu Feng propagated.

At the end of this article, I also made a point of saying that "taking this erroneous ideology about literature and art as their central point, a small literary and artistic

clique formed around Hu Feng. The feature of this small clique was their strict divorce from politics and the masses, and their being wrapped up in their own self appreciation and boosting each other. **We said that this was a small literary and artistic clique, which is not to say that they had a secret organization. Not at all. This was only a combination of ideological tendencies.**" (Note: emphasis added)

On 15 February WENYI BAO published He Qifang's article of criticism titled, "The Road to Realism, or the Road Against Realism?"

Our reason for publishing the foregoing two articles was the instructions of Premier Zhou. At the time, he said that after the discussion meetings, I hope most of all that Hu Feng himself will write a self-criticism. If he himself is unwilling to write one, it will be necessary to publish one or two open articles of criticism inasmuch as Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art has an influence in literary and art circles.

With this, the fourth open criticism of Hu Feng's ideology on literature and art was deemed ended. No other articles were published.

VI.

In July 1954, Hu Feng and others wrote "A Report on Literary and Artistic Practice since Liberation," (i.e., the 300,000-word report) which was published in XIN WENXUE SHILIAO, Issue 4, 1988.) It was presented to Xi Zhongxun [5045 0112 8113], then deputy chairman of the Government Administration Council's Culture and Education Commission. Xi Zhongxun passed it on to the CPC Central Committee. Because the leading comrades in the CPC Central Committee were very busy at the time, they did not attend to this matter right away.

In October of the same year, Chairman Mao criticized bourgeois tendencies in the studies of *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. He pointed out that some leading comrades in literature and art circles had suppressed the new life forces of Marxism and protected bourgeois power. In a letter to the Politburo, he wrote: "This business was started by two 'ordinary people,' but 'bigwigs' frequently do not pay attention, and often add obstacles. They espouse the same idealism as bourgeois writers and are willing captives of the bourgeoisie. This situation is virtually identical with what happened when the films 'Secret History of the Qing Palace,' and 'Biography of Wu Xun' were shown. 'The Secret History of the Qing Palace' was called a patriotic film when actually it was a traitorous film, and it was shown throughout the country, but has yet to be criticized to this day. Although the 'Biography of Wu Xun' has been criticized, no lessons have been learned from it. Then there was the bizarre case of people accepting Yu Pingbo's [0205 1627 0130] idealism, yet the very angry criticism from 'ordinary people' was rejected. This merits our attention."

On 28 October, RENMIN RIBAO published Yuan Shuipo's [5913 3055 2143] article, "Questions to the

Editor of WENYI BAO," which openly criticized WENYI BAO. (The article had been read and edited by Chairman Mao). Subsequently, the presidium of the ACFLAC and the presidium of the CWA jointly held an enlarged meeting of the eighth presidium from 31 October to 8 December to criticize WENYI BAO. Guo Moruo chaired the enlarged meeting. WENYI BAO editor-in-chief Feng Xuefeng, and deputy chief editor Chen Qixia made criticisms first. More than 30 people spoke at the meeting, including Yu Pingbo, Chen Xianghe [7115 5046 7729], Zheng Zhenduo [6774 2182 6995], Lao She, He Qifang, Jian Bozan [5054 0130 6363], Yang Hui [2799 2526], Tan Pimo [6223 0012 6206], You Guoen [3266 0948 1867], Nie Gannu [5119 4802 1722], Song Zhide [1345 0037 4104], Yu Heiding [0060 7815 0002], Zang Kejia, Liu Baiyu, Hu Feng, Luo Binjin [7482 6333 1015], Lu Ling, Zhong Jingwen [6988 2417 2429], Kong Luosun [1313 5012 5549], Huang Yaomian, Shi Tianshou [1597 3944 2087], Bai Ren [4101 0432], Kang Zhuo [1660 3451], Yuan Shuipo [5913 3055 2143], Wu Xue [0702 7185], Li Zhihua [2621 0037 5478], Ding Ling, Zhou Yang, Guo Moruo, and Mao Dun. They mostly criticized WENYI BAO for capitulating to bourgeois authority and for suppressing Marxism's new life forces. Hu Feng also attended this meeting. At the time, Hu Feng mistakenly believed that his "300,000-word report" had been instrumental in Chairman Mao's criticism of the leaders of literature and art circles and WEN YI BAO and that the Central Committee agreed with his views. Consequently, Hu Feng's remarks at the meeting were directed not only against WENYI BAO, but also against leaders in literary and art circles, particularly comrades such as Zhou Yang who had criticized his views.

In a speech at a meeting on 7 November, Hu Feng said, "WENYI BAO's current mistakes all have historical and ideological roots." He criticized WENYI BAO, first of all, for capitulating to bourgeois ideology, manifested in its capitulation to the reactionary ideology of Hu Shi. A concrete example he gave was that 5 years earlier WENYI BAO had published an article by Huang Yaomian, Cai Yi [5591 0308], and others, which had discussed Zhu Guangqian's [2612 0342 3383] aesthetics theory. The article "capitulated" and "pardoned" Hu Guangqian, who was "a standard bearer of the Hu Shi faction," and "someone who had served Chiang Kai-shek's fascist ideology." His second criticism was that WENYI BAO had adopted a repressive attitude toward progressive writers and ordinary people. A concrete example he gave was its suppression of A Long [7093 8263], who had tried to take issue with Zhu Guangqian on aesthetics problems. His third criticism was that in WENYI BAO's criticism, the crude sociology viewpoint predominated. Basically, WENYI BAO had used crude sociology as a weapon. It had also criticized Comrades Zhou Yang, Xiao Yin [5618 3009], and others by name. His fourth criticism was that one manifestation of crude sociology in aesthetics was formalism. A concrete example he gave was that formalism was the predominant view in a "Pen Talk" that WENYI BAO had

published on poetry. The essay had called for a fixed form, pattern, and "structure" in poetry.

Hu Feng felt that this was a golden opportunity to completely expose and criticize the thinking of literary and art circles leaders. He not only personally took part in the criticism, he also organized and anxiously incited people in various places, whose ideology was identical to his, to take part in the "struggle." For example, on 27 October, he wrote in a letter to Zhang Zhongxiao [1728 0022 2556]:

"The situation here is very fluid. First, the party organization of the CWA has conducted meetings for the past several days. In general, what has happened was the participants have conducted their own investigations and have presented reports. The Central Committee then considers the issues. There are certain to be many interesting results. Today I even heard that the more than 200,000 word thing (meaning the 300,000-word report) will be published. If it is true, it probably means that the leaders have already decided to study the problem thoroughly."

"Second, the newspapers today published Yuan Shiren's [5913 6108 0086] article attacking WENYI BAO. This is a very uncommon event. It may be regarded as an attempt to sacrifice WENYI BAO, and put most of the blame on WENYI BAO. For another thing, some people (such as the likes of Yuan Shiren) immediately stood firm, with the intent to take earliest advantage of the opportunity to attack the impregnable fortress. Third, the major speeches of the ACFLAC will also be made public. Perhaps the higher-ups are doing this to give momentum to the struggle and the gentlemen probably want to use this opportunity to reform the situation."

"Under these circumstances, some of the events that have taken place in your office during the past several months are very significant. These facts can effectively give evidence to the essence of the problem. They cannot escape."

In a 2 November letter, Hu Feng wrote to Zhang Zhongxiao:

"We have made a breakthrough and the situation is very tense. However, we have only made a breakthrough and the problem is to completely open up the discussion; this has been publically suggested. Er Ma (Feng Xuefeng) and WENYI BAO 'took the lead' in self-criticism, and the issue was fully investigated. It was wonderful to see! The first self-criticisms have been published and are not limited to the matter of The Dream of the Red Chamber. Naturally, 'the poet' (Yuan Shuipo) reaped a profit. However, he also cannot escape."

"We must move ahead cool-headedly. Brother Xing (Ji Fang [0370, fang character has the water radical on left and fang—meaning square—on the right]) must hurry up with his article. You should write one too if you can."

Hu Feng's letter of 7 November to Fang Ran [2455 3544] and Ji Fang said:

"Things are underway here. The second enlarged meeting of the ACFLAC was held today and I made a speech. The 'newspaper' (WENYI BAO) matter does not stand in isolation but gives an indication of the leanings of the leaders. To give you actual examples to show the direction already taken in issues 1 and 2: in terms of their position, they capitulate to the bourgeoisie and look upon young writers and people who do not agree with their revolutionary writers, as hostile. In matters of theory, they look at substance in terms of crude sociology, and look at form formalistically. They have degenerated over the past 5 years. This shows that they have expanded the issues at the meeting from WENYI BAO to include the entire situation.

"I have not yet finished my speech at the meeting. At the next meeting, Brother Xu (Lu Ling) is to make a denunciation.

"Originally, I had wanted you to check the data, but now I only hope that you will finish the article. You must systematically demonstrate that this is factional persecution, and point out clearly that their 'theory' is bourgeois."

Hu Feng's letter to Zhang Zhongxiao on 14 November said:

"Things are happening. Huang (Hu Feng himself) gave a speech describing the nature of WENYI BAO, which, judging from the first and second issues, has remained consistent until today. A manifestation of crude sociology in aesthetics is formalism (Yuan's capitulation to Yu Pingbo). Thus we see people challenging the bourgeoisie (Zhu Guangqian), asking for pardon (Cai Yi and the editor), attacking those with vitality (ordinary people), and disallowing ordinary people to use Marxist 'common knowledge' in waging struggle (such as A Long.) They have gathered a number of readers who blindly believe in them and have created a 'mass base,' such as is evidenced by their 'internal bulletin' which they use to attack those who would attack them. Their behavior shows that this is an issue of which faction will rule. The A Long incident has exposed the 'poet' Yuan [Shuipo]. Xu (meaning Lu Ling) gave a speech revealing past events. This is a planned attack with Zizhou (meaning Zhou Yang) as the primary instigator. He has named more than 10 people. In a few days, I will give them a rebuttal..."

On the same day, Hu Feng wrote a letter to Fang Ran:

"Xu spoke three times for 2 hours at the meeting, during which he showed that the present attack was planned and connected to historical circumstances. A group headed by Zizhou (meaning Zhou Yang) and including Fengmei (meaning Ding Ling), and Shuang Mu (meaning Lin Mohan) plotted together and proposed factional and war-lord rule. (At the meeting, he demanded that his reply be published.) The reaction after the meeting was good; people were impressed. People generally acknowledged deep down that factionalism was a fact.

"The result was that their 'agenda' was thrown into disarray (they felt the issue could not be enlarged). The

struggle has formally begun. Xu's article of approximately 40,000 words was thrown out within the day."

The Xu article to which Hu Feng's letter referred was the speech that Lu Ling made on 10 November to the enlarged meeting of the presidium of the ACFLAC and the presidium of the CWA titled "Why Such Criticism?". In this speech, he refuted by name the people who had criticized him in the past, charging that these criticisms were "filled with 'leftist' fervor." "The harmfulness of such criticism is very evident; it destroys literary creative vitality."

Thus, a new dimension was added to what began as a meeting to criticize WENYI BAO'S capitulation to the bourgeoisie and suppression of Marxist new life forces. Hu Feng and his followers, acting on the basis of their own subjective desires, mistakenly supposed that a favorable opportunity for them had arrived. They thus worked actively both inside and outside the meeting to overthrow party leadership of literature and art. They were extremely worried.

The statements of a different agenda on the part of Hu Feng, Lu Ling, and others, caused dissatisfaction among numerous comrades at the meeting. Yuan Shuipo was first to refute Hu Feng's censure. Comrades Guo Moro, Mao Dun, and others also criticized Hu Feng without mentioning his name. On 8 December, at the conclusion of the enlarged meeting of the presidiums of the ACFLAC and the CWA, Zhou Yang made a speech titled "We Must Fight." I remember that this speech had been sent to Chairman Mao to look at, but it wasn't until Zhou Yang was almost due to speak that Chairman Mao sent it back to him at the meeting. Zhou Yang's speech was divided into three parts. The first was on launching a struggle against the bourgeois idealism of the Hu Shi clique. In this section, Zhou Yang first discussed criticism of the films "Secret History of the Qing Palace" and "Biography of Wu Xun." He later criticized the bourgeois idealism in studies of *The Dream of the Red Chamber*. He emphasized the application of Marxism in explanations and studies of classic literary works. He said: "The complete and thorough exposure and criticism of the Hu Shi clique's bourgeois idealism is an extremely important combat mission of Marxists. Only through such criticism can Marxism establish a true leadership position in China's academic world."

The second part of Zhou Yang's speech was on the errors of WENYI BAO. At the same time that he analyzed and criticized WENYI BAO's mistakes, he assumed some of the blame. He said, "WENYI BAO's mistakes are certainly not those of just one or two editors. Our abandonment of criticism and struggle against bourgeois idealism was actually a capitulation to bourgeois ideology. This was the biggest mistake in our work. I also made such an error. For the past several years, I put most of my energies into the government's cultural administration. I also did not do a good job in this aspect of our work. I rarely paid attention to ideological problems in literature and art, and did not conscientiously read literary works.

I had very inadequate contact with writers of various kinds. I had very little concern about such an important publication as WENYI BAO. Therefore, I must bear substantial blame for WENYI BAO's mistakes. I have failed in the duty entrusted me by the party and the people."

The third part of Zhou Yang's speech was on the differences between Mr. Hu Feng's views and ours. In this section, Zhou Yang first refuted as "not in accordance with the facts" Hu Feng's view that "*Dream of the Red Chamber* surpassed all previous Chinese literary works in its attitude toward women, in its portrayal of women as people, and as social beings, whereas previous literary works portrayed women as 'sex incarnate' or as 'feudal virtue incarnate,' or at best, as a 'purely rebellious point of view.'" "Such an interpretation still depreciates the positive significance of *Dream of the Red Chamber* and shows that he still extremely depreciates the motherland's literary heritage." Then Zhou Yang castigated the views of the forces that Hu Feng had gathered to attack WENYI BAO's propagandization of crude sociology. Zhou Yang said:

"Crude sociology does indeed exist. Many people have vulgarized Marxism and have interpreted literary phenomena in terms of mechanistic sociology. They do not understand nor acknowledge the special character of literature and art. They believe that the subject of literary works is not the lives of real people but rather social rules and regulations. They believe that literary works are only depictions of political concepts, and do not devote serious attention to character creation and expressing the inner vitality of the characters. They believe that all literature of the past was written by the propagandists and supporters of past economic and political systems. They believe that the literature of the new age must depart from the heritage of the past and begin anew. Yes, we did not sufficiently criticize such crude sociology in the past, and we even mixed such crude sociological views into many articles that sought to publicize the Marxist theory of literature and art. This was our mistake. We must correct these mistakes and struggle against all crude sociological views in literature. If I have made such mistakes in my articles, I will certainly resolutely correct them. Here, I also want to say in passing that Mr. Hu Feng's nihilistic attitude toward China's literary and art heritage, ethnic forms in literature and art, and techniques of literatures and art are all a school of such crude sociology.

"But this is not where the current problem lies. The current problem is that Mr. Hu Feng has negated and uniformly called many truly Marxist views on literature, crude sociology—all in the name of criticizing WENYI BAO and crude sociology.

"Therefore, Mr. Hu Feng and we are superficially unanimous and vehement in our opposition to capitulating to bourgeois idealism, and in our opposition to the suppression of new life forces. However, anyone who looks behind this facade will realize that Mr. Hu Feng's plan is to use this stance as a weapon to eradicate Marxism!

"I feel I must explain that we emphasize the importance of progressive, socialist writers and the communist world view. We emphasize that literary works should express pressing political themes. Writers should create characters that are progressive, positive, and of the common people. They should stress the importance of our national literary heritage and national forms in literature and art. All of these are correct, yet they are the things that Mr. Hu Feng has always opposed. When opposing capitulation to bourgeois ideology, we must not only forbid any weakening of these views, we must strengthen their position in our literature a million times over, because without them, there would be no Marxist theory on literature, nor would there be any weapon to oppose bourgeois thinking on literature."

It should be noted that even in such a combative speech, Zhou Yang still emphasized the following:

"I said above that we have a fundamental disagreement with Mr. Hu Feng and others on literary and art theory, but this is not to deny the literary and artistic labor and achievements of Mr. Hu Feng, Mr. A Long, and Mr. Lu Ling. At the same time, some of the views that Mr. Hu Feng and Mr. Lu Ling expressed at the meeting are good and should be emphasized. We will sincerely accept all corrections of their views." (Note: emphasis added)

Finally, Zhou Yang concluded his speech with this statement: "We must fight to safeguard and develop Marxism, protect socialist realism, develop scientific, literary, and artistic endeavors, go through the socialist revolution, and build China into a great socialist nation!" This speech was subsequently published in the 10 December issue of RENMIN RIBAO.

Hu Feng's speech at the enlarged meeting of the presidiums of the ACFLAC and the CWA attracted the CPC Central Committee's attention and serious interest in the 300,000-word report that he had tendered some time earlier. The Central Committee recommended that the CWA presidium turn the report over to WENYI BAO for publication and public discussion. On 12 January 1955, the CWA presidium published Hu Feng's report with a preface, the full text of which read:

"In July 1954, Hu Feng presented a report to the CPC Central Committee containing views on literary and artistic matters, which the CPC Central Committee turned over to this association's presidium for handling. The presidium of this association believes that the portion of the report on literary and art theory, and the portion on personnel and leadership has a bearing on important issues in the current literary and art movement. It is largely a rebuttal to two articles criticizing Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art by Lin Mohan and He Qifang that WENYI BAO carried in 1953. Thus, it should be openly discussed by literary and art circles and WENYI BAO readers, after which a conclusion should be drawn on the basis of the discussions. We have decided to print the two aforementioned portions of Hu Feng's report in a special booklet to be published by WENYI BAO for

readers to study and to begin the discussion. To facilitate study, the two articles by Lin Mohan and He Qifang will also be reprinted alongside."

After Hu Feng found out that WENYI BAO was going to publish his report and organize public discussion of it, he went to see Zhou Yang on the evening of 14 January to admit his mistake and to request that his report be published with a preface, "My Statement," which he had written. The statement read as follows:

"After the launching of the current movement to criticize bourgeois ideology, I received many lessons and am in the process of examining this 'material' (meaning Hu Feng's report of his views). With the open publication of this material, I have two statements to make first:

"1. I already have a preliminary realization that the attitude expressed in this 'material' toward the party and toward literature is mistaken and harmful.

"2. The judgments made in this material on today's literature and art movement contain a very large subjective component. Some of the specific circumstances and examples raised were not well investigated and researched at the time. Later, some portions were found to be at variance with reality, but now that the 'material' has been printed, it is too late to make revisions.

"I take responsibility for everything I said above and hope that comrades will conduct a criticism."

Zhou Yang immediately wrote a letter to Central Committee Propaganda Department director Lu Dingyi [7120 1353 0001] on 15 January, requesting instructions. The letter was also forwarded to Chairman Mao. It said:

"Last night Hu Feng came by to talk. He admitted that he had made mistakes, and said that he had used a bourgeois point of view instead of a proletarian point of view, that his ideological methods were one-sided and contained individualistic heroism, and his thinking had developed to the point that he opposed the party's leadership in literature and art. He said that he now fully realizes the problem and thus feels very 'relaxed'. He said that he has always been an 'optimist'. He repeatedly asked me what I thought of his current understanding and of his conduct. I said that his adoption of a critical attitude toward his own erroneous thinking was good; however, realizing and criticizing one's own mistakes is by no means easy. One has to go through a painful process. He should be prepared to listen to more criticism from others. As for his conduct, each person has his own distinctive personality, but one's personal conduct should be open and aboveboard; one should not have a mentality marked by antipathy and gloom.

"Finally, he expressed the hope that the report he gave to the Central Committee would not be published (meaning the report of his views). If it had to be published, he hoped to make some revisions. He said some of the content was not factual. I said that publication and public discussion

would be beneficial. If you want to revise your views and the facts, you could write another article. We could also publish it. He said that he had already written a self-criticism, and that he could turn it in next Tuesday. He hoped that it could be published at the same time as the report. I said that there probably was not enough time and that it could be published next week. He said that if this were the case, he hoped to add a statement at the beginning of the article. He then handed me his written statement. I said we could take his opinion into consideration."

Zhou Yang said in his letter that he felt that Hu Feng's statement was too general and not specific. Its publication would be of no benefit to readers.

On the same day, Lu Dingyi wrote the following instructions on Zhou Yang's letter:

"I recommend that Hu Feng's statement be sent to the CWA presidium for their perusal and that the presidium give an oral reply, namely that the content is not sufficiently specific, and that a decision has been made not to publish it. As long as an article has substance, it can be published during the discussion period regardless of whether it refutes others or acknowledges one's own mistakes."

On the same day, Chairman Mao made the following comments on Zhou Yang's letter:

"Comrade Zhou Yang:

"(1) Such an announcement cannot be published: (2) Hu Feng's bourgeois idealism, and anti-party and anti-masses thinking on literature and art must be thoroughly criticized. Do not let him ensconce himself in the 'bourgeois point of view'."

This notation from Chairman Mao was sent to Comrades Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, and Deng Xiaoping, all of whom circled their names to indicate that they had read it.

On 21 January, the Central Committee Propaganda Department sent a report to the CPC Central Committee on the launching of criticism of Hu Feng's thinking. The report began by noting that the main errors in Hu Feng's views on literature and art issues (meaning the 300,000-word report) were as follows: "He systematically and perseveringly propagandizes his bourgeois idealism and his anti-party and anti-masses thinking on literature and art. Under cover of 'Marxist' garb, he negates the party nature of literature in the name of 'realism,' ignores the role of the Marxist world view in the creation of literature and art, denies the importance of having writers live among the masses and study Marxist-Leninist theory, and denies the national literary heritage and national forms in literature and art. He maintains that our advocacy of the communist world view, that writers live among workers, peasants, and soldiers, that our advocacy of ideological remodeling, our advocacy of national

forms, and our advocacy that writers write about revolutionary struggle are 'five daggers' thrust into the heads of readers and writers. He insists on emphasizing the shortcomings in our literature and art work, and vilifies the current leaders in literature and art as being an 'insane,' 'factionalist,' 'warlord regime'." The report also traced the historical origins of Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art, and the many criticisms and assistance given him by progressive literature and art circles since 1945. It analyzed the main manifestation of errors of "Hu Feng and his clique" and maintained that "at the same time that we criticize the bourgeois idealism of Hu Shi and Yu Pingbo, we should thoroughly criticize Hu Feng's bourgeois thinking on literature and art in order to eradicate his influence in literary and art circles and on readers." "However, this struggle will be a complicated and painstaking ideological struggle requiring preparation, study, and strategy." Thus, the Propaganda Department proposes "printing a special booklet containing both the portion on theory and the portion on personnel and leadership in Hu Feng's report, along with a commentary from the Chinese Writers' Association, to be published together in the first and second 1955 issues of WENYI BAO. At the same time, we should publish the articles Lin Mohan and He Qifang wrote in the past, criticizing Hu Feng in order to facilitate discussion and criticism. We have already sought the views of Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Lao She, and others on this course of action, and they have agreed with it."

I remember that Chairman Mao had also called in Lu Dingyi, Zhou Yang, and myself to his office to give him a personal briefing on plans to criticize Hu Feng. Chairman Mao agreed with the plan. When we were leaving and Chairman Mao stood up to see us off, Zhou Yang said to him that Comrade Xuefeng was very pained because of the criticism that he received for his errors in WENYI BAO. Chairman Mao said: "I wanted him to be pained!" His idea was that there had to be pain in order for there to be change.

On 26 January, the CPC Central Committee document No [55] 018 approved and forwarded the Central Committee Propaganda Department report. The circular said: "Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art is the erroneous thinking of bourgeois idealism. Under the guise of 'Marxism', he has waged an anti-party and anti-masses struggle for a long time, which has served to mislead some writers and readers; thus, he must be thoroughly criticized. CPC committees at all levels must pay attention to this ideological struggle and view it as an important struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie, and as an important means by which to propagandize materialism to oppose idealism both inside and outside the party."

Thus, a nationwide campaign to criticize Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art was launched across the board.

On 5 and 7 February, the Chinese Writers Association presidium convened an enlarged meeting. Association

chairman Mao Dun, and deputy chairmen Zhou Yang, Ding Ling, Ba Jin, Lao She, Feng Xuefeng, and Shao Quanlin, as well as Sha Ting, Liu Baiyu, Xiao San [5618 0005], Chen Baichen [7115 4101 1057], Nie Gannu, Yan Wenjing, Kang Zhuo, Wu Boxiao [0702 0130 4682], Shao Zinan [6730 1311 0589], Ceng Ke [2582 0344], Zheng Boqi [6774 0130 1142], Hu Cai [5170 6846], Cao Ming [5430 2494], Shi Tianshou [1597 3944 2087], Yu Heiding [0060 7815 0002], Ouyang Shan [2962 7122 1472], Wu Qiang [0702 1730], Fang Ji [2455 4764], Zhao Shuli [6392 2885 3810], Ai Qing, and Yuan Shuipo attended the meeting. At the meeting, it was decided that criticism should be launched against Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art. Numerous writers, artists, and theoreticians everywhere took pens in hand and writing many articles, joined in the criticism. RENMIN RIBAO and other newspapers published articles by Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Xia Yan, Nie Gannu, Qin Zhaoyang [4440 0340 7122], Cai Yi, Cao Yu [2580 4417], Bao Chang [7637 2490], Tang Tao [0781 1718], Huang Yaomian, Hu Sheng, Yang Er [2799 5101], Wang Kuang [3769 0562] Wei Junyi [7279 0689 1355], Huang Qiuyun [7806 4428 5089], Tian Han [3944 3352], Yang Xianzhen [2799 3759 3791], Shao Quanlin, Wang Yuanhua [3769 0337 0553], Li Xifan [2621 1585 0416], Lan Ling [5663 5044], Yuan Shuipo, Zhang Guangnian [1728 0342 1628], Wang Ruowang [3769 5387 2598], Zeng Yanxiu [2582 3934 0208], Zeng Zhuo [2582 0587], and Wu Qiang [0702 1730]. At this point, the foci of the criticisms and the quality and depth of the analyses differed from article to article, but most were ideological battles using argument and reasoning. Furthermore, most comrades criticized Hu Feng's thinking on literature and art out of their own genuine understanding combined with the understanding they had gained from their own long-time practice in revolution and in the arts. Many of their views and discussions still merit consideration today and cannot be brushed aside.

However, in such a large-scale mass campaign of criticism, unscientific and unrealistic arguments were bound to be produced, and some were even made out of context, exaggerated, and unconvincing. However, the person being criticized had no way of refuting them. The Central Committee Propaganda Department addressed this problem by issuing a circular to propaganda departments everywhere, requiring that critical articles be factual so as to be reasonable and convincing. It also presented some examples of statements taken out of context, asking that all localities take note. I remember that one of the most representative of such articles was by the renowned Ge Yang [2047 2254], who criticized the poem "Green Plain" that was published in XIN GUANCHANG [NEW OBSERVER]. In his criticism, he picked out a sentence here and another sentence there from the long poem and put them all together to come to an extremely serious conclusion. This circular was drafted by the literature and art office of the Propaganda Department. I read it, and it was signed and issued in the name of the department, but it probably had little effect.

VII.

Question: How did the Hu Feng issue develop from a dispute about literary and art theory, and a small clique problem, into a counterrevolutionary political issue?

Answer: This was a problem that no one could anticipate and for which I have no easy answer.

One day around April 1955, Shu Wu came to the Central Committee Propaganda Department office in Zhongnanhai to see me. He handed me a bound book of letters that Hu Feng had written him, saying that there were many things in it that I should read. At that time, I believed that there could be nothing interesting in private letters, so I just put the book on the bookcase without it serious attention. After a while, I happened to pick it up and thumb through it. I discovered a lot of code words in it such as "the two mandarin jackets" (meaning He Qifang and Liu Baiyu), "the gentry" (meaning the Chongqing progressive writers at the time), "the mandarins," "the bigwigs," "the lords and masters" (meaning some CPC members and party cadres in authoritative positions), the up-and-coming sordid merchant (meaning Mao Dun), and "performing ceremonial dances" (meaning the activities of progressive literary and art circles at the time). There were also some words filled with sarcasm and loathing, such as, "Because the two mandarin jackets were there, the gentry behaved as though greeting an imperial envoy, and I could only accompany them in bowing low." "To be a merchant, one has to go whoring and gambling with one's customers. One has to stand in this circle without falling over, and one has to oblige by performing a ceremonial dance." "Actually I should have bowed out of ceremonial dancing these past several years, or else just danced a devilish dance, but I continued to mingle with maggots (meaning people in progressive literature and art circles)." "Returning respects to the great masters (meaning those who criticized Shu Wu's 'On Subjectivism') is too much like cockfighting. It is not very dignified. Wrapping rubber around a steel wire to be used as a whip to beat prisoners hurts without leaving any marks. I think this is a good method." "I have accumulated too much anger and hatred, but feel that my adversaries are too large, so I would like to fight by binding hand grenades together." I understood what Hu Feng was talking about and about whom. Frankly, on seeing such a hateful attitude toward so many party and non-party writers, and such hateful feelings in the letters that Hu Feng had sent to Shu Wu, I could not help but feel extremely alarmed, surprised, and angry. Although we did not agree with his views on literature and art, the party organization had always regarded him as a progressive worker in literature and art, and looked upon him as one of the family. We never had imagined that he could adopt such an attitude behind our backs. Some people have said that I had asked Shu Wu to give these letters to me. This is strange. I had no special powers. How could I know that Shu Wu might have these "valuable letters"?

Because I had some contact with Hu Feng, I was able to understand some of the code words in the letters, but there were also many that I did not understand. So, I had Shu Wu come and explain some of the parts that could not be readily understood, and to arrange the letters according to their content so that they would be more readable. Shu Wu agreed and very quickly organized them. A day or two later he handed them to me. He had sorted them out very clearly. After reading them, I turned them over to Zhou Yang. After Zhou Yang read them, he discussed with me whether they could be openly published, and I approved. Then, these materials were given to WENYI BAO with a request that chief editor Kang Zhuo add an editor's note and publish them. WENYI BAO prepared a proof and sent it to Zhou Yang and me to read. We both felt that the editor's note was good and were about to send to Kang Zhuo for publication. All of a sudden Comrade Zhou Yang felt that because these materials were rather important, they should be sent to Chairman Mao to be looked at. I agreed. On 9 May, Zhou Yang sent Chairman Mao the "self-criticism" that Hu Feng had written, along with a final proof of the material that Shu Wu had provided. He also wrote the following letter to the chairman:

"Chairman:

"We are planning to publish both Hu Feng's self-criticism and the revealing material that Shu Wu has provided in the next issue of WENYI BAO (the issue of the 15th of this month). We have attached an editor's note on front of Hu article. The final proof is being forwarded for your examination and approval. The same issue of WENYI BAO will carry an article in which Xu Guangping [6079 1639 1627] refutes Hu Feng."

On 11 May, Chairman Mao wrote the following instructions on Zhou Yang's letter:

"Comrade Zhou Yang: The editor's note is no good. I have written another one. Will you and Comrade Lu Dingyi take a look and decide whether it can be used? If you feel it can, please make a copy, send it to the printer, and return the original draft to me!"

"It may be published in RENMIN RIBAO, then in WENYI BAO. Fairly big type should be used for the editor's note."

"If you disagree, you and Lu Dingyi may come to my place to talk about it after 11 o'clock tonight, or tomorrow afternoon."

The editor's note in the 13 May issue of RENMIN RIBAO was the comments that Chairman Mao had written. The headline on Shu Wu's revealing material was changed from "Some Data on the Hu Feng Small Clique" to "Some Data on the Hu Feng Anti-Party Group." The editor's note said:

"We are only now publishing Hu Feng's 'My Self-Criticism', which he had written in January this year,

revised in February, and for which he wrote an 'addendum' in March. We are also publishing Shu Wu's 'Some Data On the Hu Feng Anti-Party Group'. Our reason for publishing this is to prevent Hu Feng from continuing to use our newspaper to deceive the readers. From the material revealed in the Shu Wu article, readers can see how Hu Feng and the anti-party and anti-masses literary and art clique that he led have long been hostile to, looked with hatred upon, and utterly detested both CPC and non-party progressive writers. In the letters that Hu Feng wrote to Shu Wu, can readers possibly detect any revolutionary flavor? Is not the flavor that these letters impart exactly the same as that in SHEHUI XINWEN [SOCIAL NEWS] and XINWEN TIANDI [NEWS WORLD] magazines, which Kuomintang intelligence agencies publish? Can we believe such statements as 'the petty bourgeoisie's revolutionary spirit and standpoint,' 'realistic literature and art that combats the various feudal traditions and is based on democratic demands,' 'a standpoint of shared destiny with the people,' 'revolutionary humanist spirit,' 'anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, people's liberation revolutionary ideology,' 'in accordance with the party's political programs,' and 'were it not for the revolution and the Chinese Communist Party, I personally would not have been able to settle down and make a living the past 20-some years? If they were not intellectuals who sail under false flags, and who have a truly 'petty bourgeois revolutionary spirit and standpoint' (Tens of thousands of such people exist in China; they cooperate with the CPC, and willingly accept the party's leadership), would they have such hostile, hateful, and spiteful attitude toward the party and progressive writers? Falseness is falseness and the camouflage must be stripped away. It is possible that there are still others in the Hu Feng counterrevolutionary clique like Shu Wu, who have been duped and are unwilling to tag after Hu Feng forever. They should provide the party with more material that exposes Hu Feng. Deception cannot be maintained for long; sooner or later it will be revealed. A strategy that shifts from being on the offensive to being in retreat (i.e., self-criticism) cannot deceive people either. Self-criticism has to be like the self-criticism of Shu Wu. False self-criticism will not work. Lu Ling must have received even more secret letters from Hu Feng. We hope that he will hand them over. All who have associated with Hu Feng and have received secret letters from him should turn them over. Turning them over is better than keeping or destroying them. Hu Feng should work to strip away the false front instead of performing deceptive self-criticism. The only way out for Hu Feng and every member of the Hu Feng clique is to strip away the false front, reveal the truth, help the party completely clarify the situation regarding Hu Feng and his anti-party group, and from here on, become a genuine person."

WENYI BAO'S original editor's comments cannot be found today, but I remember that its content and tone were much more moderate. Chairman Mao's comments had characterized the Hu Feng small group as an anti-party and anti-masses literary and art small group. This came as a surprise to me and some other comrades.

However, at that time I only felt that my own ideological standards were low and that I lacked political sensitivity. I raised no objection to the comment, nor did other comrades. In this way, what began as a difference of opinion among the people over literary and art theory, and a small group problem, became elevated to a political problem in the nature of a contradiction between the enemy and ourselves.

I must explain that except for the comment that Chairman Mao had revised, no changes had been in the material that Shu Wu had provided. Shu Wu's material published in RENMIN RIBAO was identical to the WENYI BAO final proof that Chairman Mao had read. Some people said that after the Chairman determined the nature of the Hu Feng problem, Shu Wu rearranged classified the data and wrote a small caption in response to a request to do so. This does not accord with the facts. Shu Wu explained his reason for providing the material at the end of the data: "In these letters, Hu Feng's idealist ideology is seen even more clearly than in his articles. He believes that ideology exists independently and even believes that 'subjectivism is at work,' and that a 'strong will runs through China.' Above the word 'materialism', he added the two words 'sordid merchant', showing how he scorns and feels revulsion against materialism. It also makes shows that Hu Feng fully supported the many erroneous articles I had written at the time that propagandized idealism and individualism. It was not at all as he claimed later, saying that he did not approve of those articles." "My main purpose in providing these materials here is to help everyone further understand the nature of Hu Feng's ideological mistakes in literature and art and to enable me to further examine my past errors."

On 16 May, the Ministry of Public Security arrested Hu Feng. Before his arrest, the NPC Standing Committee held a meeting and passed a resolution cancelling Hu Feng's eligibility to serve as a delegate.

At the time of Hu Feng's arrest, many letters from people close to him were also found in his home. These letters also contained many code words that public security agencies could not understand. They asked the Central Committee Propaganda Department to send several people who had a better understanding of Hu Feng's situation to sort out these letters. The people who took part me, He Qifang, Liu Baiyu, Zhang Guangnian, Guo Xiaochuan [6753 1420 1557], Yuan Shuipo, and some comrades from the literature and art office of the CPC Committee Propaganda Department. We also sorted out a second and a third batch of material. While excerpting and sorting out these materials, we repeatedly checked our work against the original letters so as not to distort the letters' original meaning.

On 24 May, RENMIN RIBAO published "A Second Batch of Material About the Hu Feng Anti-Party Group." This batch consisted mainly of excerpts from

letters that Hu Feng had written to friends. The comments at the beginning, middle, and end of these materials had been revised by Chairman Mao, and some had been personally added by him.

On 6 June, Chairman Mao wrote these comments after receiving the third batch of material, and a RENMIN RIBAO editorial:

"Comrades Dingyi and Zhou Yang:

"I have not yet read the editorial. I have made some revisions to the footnotes to 'the third batch of material' and added several paragraphs. I ask that either you two, or several other comrades that you may invite, such as Chen Boda, Hu Qiaomu, Deng Tuo, and Lin Mohan, talk this over to determine whether it is satisfactory. I think we should take this opportunity to write an article for inclusion.

"I hope that the final proof will be ready this afternoon. After it is typed up, please send one copy each to Liu, Zhou, Xiaoping, Peng Zhen, Peng Dehuai, Dong Biwu, Zhang Wentian, and Kang Sheng (Comrades Zhu, Lin, and Chen Yu were not home), as well as to the people you want to send it to, and ask them to give their opinions. Postscript."

The editor's note to the third batch of material had been written entirely by Chairman Mao. However, there was no note attached to the letter that Zhang Zhongxiao had written to Hu Feng attacking the "Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art." This did not seem right. Zhou Yang and I believed that this was because the chairman did not want to refer to a matter having to do with himself, so he and I jointly drafted a commentary for inclusion.

On 8 June, after revising the editorial, Chairman Mao wrote this additional comment:

"Comrades Dingyi, Zhou Yang, and Deng Tuo:

"I have made some revisions and additions to both the editorial and the data. Please consider them and use as you see fit. Please make another final proof incorporating these changes and send a copy to each of the comrades on the Politburo. When writing, please avoid using exaggerated modifiers, otherwise you will weaken the impact. You must pay attention to the logical limits of every phrase and to the orderly presentation of the article as a whole. Every effort should be made to get rid of excess verbiage."

Chairman Mao's comments on 'writing the article' were directed mainly at the draft of the RENMIN RIBAO editorial. After Chairman Mao's deletions and revisions, this editorial that Deng Tuo had drafted was left with virtually only a single topic. On 10 June, RENMIN RIBAO published "The Third Batch of Material on the Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Group," and an editorial titled, "We Must Learn Lessons From the Hu Feng

Case." With the publication of the third batch of material, the formulation "Hu Feng anti-party group" had become without exception, the "Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Group."

After the third batch of material on the Hu Feng group was published, a tide of condemnation against Hu Feng was heard from people from all walks of life. The Central Committee decided to print a small handbook of the Hu Feng materials for distribution throughout the country. Chairman Mao wrote a foreword to this book. On 12 June, Chairman Mao gave these instructions:

"Comrade Dingyi, Zhou Yang, and Deng Tuo:

"I wrote a foreword, two comments, and made some stylistic changes. After you have read them, please prepare a final proof and distribute it to the comrades who were at the last meeting to read and revise, then send it off to the printer."

In the wee hours of 16 June, Chairman Mao wrote these additional instructions:

"Comrades Dingyi, Zhou Yang, and Deng Tuo:

"I made some more revisions. Please look it over again. If there are no no errors, have it printed and provide a master to all localities for printing.

"When this book is published, you may publish the 'Foreword' in RENMIN RIBAO (titled 'Foreword to Data on the Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Group') in order to draw people's attention to it."

The foreword and commentary were later included in volume 5 of the *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*.

After Hu Feng's arrest, one of his old friends, Zhu So-and-so, revealed the following, which has been verified: During the Northern Expedition, Hu Feng had been a member of the Socialist Youth League. After the defeat of the great revolution, he had worked in the Kuomintang Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters, and in the propaganda section of the political department of the 31st Communist Suppression Army in Jiangxi where he wrote the "Communist Suppression Propaganda Outline." Later on, the Ministry of Public Security found this reactionary propaganda piece in the Ji'an Library. Hu Feng never explained this period of history. In "My Biographical Sketch," which Hu Feng wrote in May 1979, he added the following words: "After returning to my native village to take part in the revolution, I sustained some setbacks and was misled." This is a matter that belongs to political history.

I remember Luo Ruijing once told me that Chairman Mao several times urged a rapid decision on the Hu Feng case. It should not always remain unresolved. However, this case dragged on until 1965 before it was decided on. Hu Feng was sentenced to 14 years in prison and stripped of his political rights for 6 years; his sentence was to be served outside of prison. However, slightly more than half a year later, the turmoil of the "Cultural

Revolution" began and Hu Feng was put in prison. His sentence was also changed to life in prison. It was not until May 1978, 2 years after the smashing of the "gang of four" that he was released. The political, daily life, and mental hardships that Hu Feng and his family, as well as those implicated endured during this more than 20-year period were extremely grave. In 1980, the relevant authorities re-examined the Hu Feng case. The facts demonstrated that declaring Hu Feng and some comrades close to Hu Feng to be counterrevolutionaries at that time was truly a mistake. The Hu Feng case was a serious miscarriage of justice.

VIII.

Question: The book titled *The Hu Feng Case From Beginning to End* said that when his son asked him, "Why did Mao Zedong call you a counterrevolutionary," the seriously ill Hu Feng only replied: "Possibly he resented me for not respecting him." What is your view on this?

Answer: When researching the reasons that gave rise to a historical situation, one has to examine events in terms of the conditions at the time. I believe that the reasons given for condemning Hu Feng group as counterrevolutionary are complex, had a historical imperative, and were also partly accidental. In terms of the social background at the time, new China was in the initial period of construction and consolidation. After having gone through the suppression of counterrevolutionaries, resistance to America and aid to Korea, land reform, and the three and five antis campaigns, the young republic was just entering the stage of socialist transformation when class struggle was still extraordinarily intense. In March 1955, at the National Party Congress, which had been convened just 2 months before the Hu Feng case was declared to be that of a counterrevolutionary group, Chairman Mao summarized the struggle against the Gao [Gang] and Rao [Shushi] anti-party group. In his speech, he emphasized that "imperialist power is still around us. We must prepare to deal with possible sudden changes in the situation. ... This is one thing. Another thing is that the activities of remnant counterrevolutionary forces in the country remain very rampant. We must deliver several attacks against them in a planned, analytical, and realistic way to further weaken hidden, counterrevolutionary forces in order to ensure the safety of our country's socialist endeavors. If we take appropriate measures in these two regards, we can avoid serious damage from the enemy; otherwise, we may make a mistake."

Chairman Mao's speech reflected the party's basic estimate at the time of the international and domestic class struggle, and the actions that had to be taken. This analysis and action must be said to have been consistent with objective circumstances at that time, and necessary. At the same time, however, the estimate contained an excessively "leftist" sentiment regarding domestic class struggle. It also suffered the shortcoming of insufficient

understanding of the complex situation existing in literature and art circles. It was against this background that a mistake was made about the nature of the Hu Feng case.

The Hu Feng case was also very much related to the country's imperfect legal system and to the development of a Chairman Mao personality cult. The Communist Party of China headed by Chairman Mao led the Chinese people in toppling the three big mountains [imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratism], and establishing a brand new China. The CPC enjoyed lofty prestige, and Chairman Mao's prestige was also very high. Because of the imperfections of the legal system, lack of scientific legal procedures and standards for measuring penalties, and people's extreme confidence in Chairman Mao, when he declared Hu Feng's small group to be counterrevolutionaries on the basis of private correspondence, I and other comrades did not have any doubts or disagreement on the decision. We simply believed that our own level of understanding was low; we did not see clearly the nature of the problem.

In addition, I feel that there was an accidental aspect to the creation of the wrongful case against Hu Feng. Factually speaking, the reason that the criticism of Hu Feng changed from an issue of ideology regarding literature and art to a political issue was closely related to Shu Wu's turning over of that batch of letters. Before reading this batch of letters, for more than 10 years, both in areas under control of the Kuomintang regime and in Hong Kong, as well as in post-liberation Beijing, we had always believed that the argument with Hu Feng was simply a difference of opinion about literature and art theory, and that we were identical politically. If one were to brand Hu Feng as a counterrevolutionary because he did not respect Chairman Mao, then Liang Shuming's [2733 3359 3298] face-to-face contradiction of Chairman Mao at the CPPCC may be said to be great disrespect, yet Chairman Mao did not make Liang out to be counterrevolutionary, nor did he remove him from his other duties. All he did was criticize him ideologically. Up until Shu Wu handed over the Hu Feng letters, Chairman Mao also did not regard him as counterrevolutionary. He only declared Hu Feng's thinking to be anti-party and anti-Marxist in nature. Criticism and struggle were limited to the ideological field. However, when Chairman Mao saw that Hu Feng had written those letters behind his back (none of which contained words attacking Chairman Mao personally), and his hostile, belittling, and hateful words and attitude toward CPC and non-party progressive writers, his suspicions and indignation were aroused. I believe that this was an important reason why Chairman Mao branded the Hu Feng small group a "counterrevolutionary group." This point may be clearly seen from Chairman Mao's revision of the editor's note in the 13 May issue of RENMIN RIBAO. I remember a meeting of the CPC Secretariat that took place during August or September 1980 when the redressing of the "Hu Feng counterrevolutionary group" case was discussed. One Central Committee

leading comrade said: "The 'Hu Feng counterrevolutionary group' case was mishandled. It should be redressed. Nevertheless, Hu Feng's organization of a small group among literature and art circles, and telling the CPC one thing to its face while doing something else behind its back could only make people suspicious, and should serve as a warning."

Even so, branding Hu Feng counterrevolutionary, jailing him, and sentencing him solely on the basis of some personal correspondence was wrong no matter what. History has shown this to be so.

Question: What lessons do you believe we should draw from the Hu Feng case?

Answer: What I said above was all a lesson. I believe that the greatest lesson was that we failed to conduct a full investigation and study, and mixed up two kinds of contradictions of different natures. An example was the implication of A Long who, provided our party and army with enemy intelligence before liberation. However, solely on the basis of an obscure phrase or two in the letters, and without any investigation or verification, he was branded an enemy agent. Consequently, he suffered an injustice that was not corrected. This lesson is extremely painful. After the Hu Feng case was redressed, numerous wronged comrades held no feelings of resentment, but rather actively worked on behalf of the party and the motherland. This is extremely commendable.

Second, we should use academic discussions, ideological debates, criticisms, and rebuttals to find the solution to differences in understanding and opinion in ideology and academics, but we should not use criticism by the masses. The education in Marxist ideology linked to actual effects that our party has conducted since liberation has been successful. Results from the several mass ideological criticism campaigns that have been launched, however, have not been good. Not only did they not truly resolve problems in ideological understanding, but they frequently turned academic problems into political problems and resulted in serious, evil consequences. I believe that Chairman Mao officially summarized the lessons from experience gained during several post-liberation ideological and academic criticism campaigns (including the criticism of Hu Feng). In 1957, he proposed the policy of "let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools of thought contend."

In 1990, the CPC Central Committee Office's "Supplementary Notice on the Further Rehabilitation of Comrade Hu Feng" said: "A correct solution to Comrade Hu Feng's ideology and position on literature and art must be sought in accordance with the provisions of the constitution on academic freedom and freedom of criticism, the party's policy of 'let a hundred flowers bloom, let a hundred schools of thought contend', and the conducting of regular and scientific criticism of literature and art by readers and by literature and art circles." This conclusion is, without doubt, entirely correct.

The foregoing is all that I know about the historical process of the Hu Feng case. People with a different standpoint and opinion about historical events may view and evaluate them differently. Thus, discussion or argument is possible. However, when dealing with historical events, one must first clarify "what they were." Only then can one answer "why they were that way." Any fact in a historical event may be reported in many different ways, but only one is true. Both cannot be true; it is either one or the other. History is not mud or dough. It cannot be molded at will according to anyone's subjective needs. As for the Hu Feng case, I only wish to provide some true materials for the reference of researchers, so that they can make a more accurate judgment in order to avoid passing along unfounded rumors.

Finally, I would like to say the following: If I did anything wrong, or if I said anything wrong, I will certainly acknowledge my errors and strive to rectify them. However, I certainly will not "repent" to anyone. This is because I have always acted on the basis of my own understanding, and on what I believed to be in the party's interests and requirements at the time. I did not act against my convictions, nor did I knowingly act against the party's interests and requirements. This was true in the past, is true today, and will be true in the future. There is no question of "repentance" or forgiveness here.

Huang: Comrade Mohan. I am extremely grateful to you for taking such trouble to talk to me so many times.

Lin: Not at all. Rather I must thank you for taking such long notes and doing so much for clarification. You have gone to a lot of trouble!

May 1989, during the great upheaval in Beijing.

Hu Feng's Wife Refutes Lin Mohan's View of Hu Feng Case

91CM0369A Beijing ZUOPIN YU ZHENGMI
[LITERARY WORKS AND CONTENTION]
in Chinese No 2, 17 Feb 91 pp 74-78

[Article by Mei Zhi (2734 1807): "Historical Truth—On Reading Comrade Lin Mohan's 'The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case'"; originally published in XIN WENXUE SHILIAO [NEW LITERATURE HISTORICAL DATA] No 1, 1990]

[Text] I.

In his article titled "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case," published in XIN WENXUE SHILIAO [NEW LITERATURE HISTORICAL DATA], Comrade Lin Mohan expressed a point that I heartily agree with. This is: People who have different standpoints and viewpoints about historical events may view them and evaluate them differently; thus, they may discuss or dispute them. However, one must first clarify the 'what' of a historical event before one can answer the 'why' of it. A

given fact in a historical event may be passed along in various ways, but only one report is true. Two cannot be true; it is either one or another. History is not mud or dough that can be kneaded and molded according to anyone's subjective will.

Looking back to those days, Hu Feng and the "Hu Feng elements" were "kneaded and molded at will" to form "a bunch of counterrevolutionary elements closely linked to imperialism and the Chiang Kai-shek bandit clique." This clique had "the task of overthrowing the People's Republic of China and restoring imperialism and Kuomintang rule." They were also convicted and punished on the basis of one "truth," after that truth was "kneaded and molded at will." As Comrade Lin Mohan said in the article, this case "had broad implications and extended over a long period. It created very great shock in literature and art circles and in society at large, and caused very great suffering for its victims." It was not until after the Third Plenary Session of the 11th CPC Central Committee that the Central Committee redressed the mishandled case in 1980. In 1985, following Hu's death, the Central Committee also affirmed in "a condolence" that Hu Feng was a "fighter in modern Chinese revolutionary literature and art." "Comrade Hu Feng's whole life was spent in search of light and demanding progress. It was a life of ardent love for the motherland, ardent love for the people, and efforts to contribute to literature and art." "No matter the conditions, Comrade Hu Feng maintained a staunch faith in the party, the people, and socialism, and he deserves to be emulated by us." In June 1988, the Central Committee rehabilitated Hu Feng further. Also, as Comrade Lin Mohan said in the article, "The Central Committee's decision on two rehabilitations were an embodiment of the party's seeking truth from facts and its spirit of the need to correct mistakes. At the same time, it also points out a clear direction for our correct summarization of the historical lessons of the Hu Feng case." After 20 to 30 years, history has gradually restored the truth, and has finally clarified "how" the historical event was.

As one of the victims during those years, when I look back at this historical period I still find it very difficult to restrain my own feelings. In his article, Comrade Lin Mohan said that "As a participant in the Hu Feng case, I bear a certain responsibility, and I am profoundly regretful." I feel gratified by his attitude.

It was based on Lin Mohan's viewpoint that at the beginning of this article I quoted Comrade Lin Mohan as further expressing the purpose of the article: "I only intend to provide some true data about the Hu Feng case for scholars' reference, so that they can judge more accurately and avoid the spread of falsehoods." I feel this to be even more praiseworthy.

In his article, Comrade Lin Mohan outlined some formerly little-known events which I think will help correctly summarize the lessons of history. However, there are some discrepancies in substance and fact. As a party concerned and as one who knew the situation, I have

responsibility to provide some explanations here in order to "avoid the spread of falsehoods."

II.

The following passage appears in Comrade Lin Mohan's article: "After Hu Feng was arrested, an old friend named Zhu disclosed—and this has been verified—that during the Northern Expedition, Hu was a member of the Socialist Youth League. However, after the great revolution failed, he worked first in the Kuomintang Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters, and then in the propaganda section of the political department of the 31st Communist Suppression Army in Chaofong, Jiangxi, where he wrote the 'Communist Suppression Propaganda Outline.' Later on, the Public Security Bureau found this reactionary piece of propaganda in the Ji'an library in Jiangxi. Hu Feng never accounted for this period of history. In 'My Biographical Sketch,' which Hu Feng wrote in May 1979, he appended the following sentence: 'After returning to my native village to take part in the revolution, I suffered some setbacks and was misled.' This is a matter that belongs to political history."

This passage is actually a restatement of the "Editor's Note" to the 1955 "Third Group of Material About the Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Clique" which was used to substantiate the charge that "Hu Feng and the Kuomintang reactionary clique were closely associated." (Another sentence was added to this, that they were "closely associated" with imperialism. No explanation was offered in this third group of data, beyond the fictitious statement that "he went to Japan, where he muddled around for a while and engaged in some dealings that he cannot disclose.") Furthermore, this passage was also one of the main "criminal facts" used in the 1965 judgment against Hu Feng, and it was one of the main bases for his sentencing. Thus, it is necessary to make some individual concrete explanations to illuminate historical truth.

Following the failure of the great revolution and the "15 July" [1925] Nanjing-Hankou reconciliation [between Chiang Kai-shek and Wang Qingwei], when Wang Qingwei turned anti-communist, Hu Feng went to work in the propaganda section of the Kuomintang's Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters. At that time, the Kuomintang's Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters was controlled by Kong Geng, Li Hanjun, Deng Chumin, and Zhan Dabai. The *Biography of Hubei Heroes and Martyrs* compiled by the Hubei Province CPC Historical Personage Research Society and the Hubei Provincial Department of Civil Affairs and published in October 1984 contains the following exposition in a section on martyr Li Hanjun: "When Dong Biwu was about to leave Wuhan, he went to chat with Li Junhan. The party had not provided for a rear guard following its retreat, so people who had formerly cooperated with the party were left behind to work a little. According to Mr. Deng

Chumin's recollection, 'After 15 July... during this critical juncture, Li Hanjun and I luckily received instructions from Comrade Li Fuchun. He said we should keep the organization going for as long as possible.' Li Hanjun, as well as Deng Chumin, Zhan Dabei, and Zhang Guoen, remained in the Kuomintang provincial government, where they used their legal status to unite with Kuomintang founding members Kong Geng and Li Shucheng. They launched a special struggle with the Kuomintang right wing, doing a lot of useful work for the revolution." Hu Feng was invited to work in the propaganda department by Deng Chumin, the provincial Kuomintang Headquarters Propaganda Department chief at the time. Hu abided by Deng's order to help edit and proofread WUHAN PINGLUN [Wuhan Review], the house organ of the provincial Kuomintang Headquarters. However, all articles were published only after Deng Chumin had read them and decided that they should be published. (Following the founding of the People's Republic, Comrade Deng Chumin held the successive posts of deputy chairman and vice-governor of the Shanxi Provincial Government. He was a member of the NPC standing committee, a member of the Standing Committee of the Second and Third Chinese People's Political Consultative Conferences, and deputy chairman of the third and fourth central committees of the Democratic League. In 1962, he became a member of the CPC. Both before and after liberation, Hu Feng maintained a private relationship with Deng.) Hu Feng's writings while in prison spoke of his understanding at the time: "The provincial party headquarters founded by the well-known leftists Kong Geng, Li Hanjun (whom I still revere), Zhan Dabei, and Deng Chumin may have had a secret, tacit relationship with the CPC, and I might as well join also..." From the material now available, it seems that Hu Feng's estimate at the time agreed with the reality. In short, to bring up where Hu Feng "worked" and his entry into the provincial party headquarters in isolation from the specific context of the Hubei Kuomintang Provincial Headquarters at the time may, I fear, give readers a wrong impression. There is no way to "make a more accurate judgment" on this basis.

As for "having worked in the propaganda section of the political department of the 31st Communist Suppression Army in Chaogong, Jiangxi," this too must be related to the specific circumstances at that time. At the end of 1927, Guangxi Clique warlords Hu Zongduo and Tao Jun occupied Wuhan, and Wuhan had fallen under a white terror. At the same time, Yang Chao [2799 6389], Hu Feng's good friend and a Communist Party member, was arrested in Jiangxi. In order help Yang Chao and escape the white terror in Wuhan, Hu Feng went to Jiangxi. It was not until he reached Nanchang that Hu found out that Yang had died the previous day. Hu could not return to Wuhan at this time. (Li Hanjun and Zhan Dabei had already been murdered for the crime of being "reds and planning insurrection.") At this time Mu Jibo, Hu Feng's old teacher, was secretary general in the political department of Jin Handing's army in Yunnan. (According to *Memoirs of Hu Lanqi* [5170 5695 3971]

and memoirs of other comrades, at that time Jin Handing's army was the Ninth Army of Zhu Peide's Fifth Route Army; it was not the 31st Army). Mu invited him to work in the propaganda section of the political department. Since he could use this offer to avoid destruction and gain a foothold, and since he did not want to offend his old teacher, Hu Feng accepted the offer. He only worked in the propaganda section for 28 days. He was called to account and lost his position for being unwilling to give speeches on the Three People's Principles to the army headquarters. In addition, after leaving the propaganda section, Hu Feng was twice detained on suspicion of being a member of the Communist Party, once when expressing sympathy and solicitude to the family of Communist Party member Huang Keqian following Huang's arrest. Both times he used his social contacts to obtain release. Naturally, these tiny "facts" were unworthy of attention in 1955 and 1965.

Finally there is his so-called "writing of the Communist Suppression Propaganda Outline." There was such an unsigned essay, but it was called the "Anti-Communist Propaganda Outline," not the "Communist Suppression Propaganda Outline," and Hu Feng did not write it. In 1955, since there was only one person's "disclosures," and no other proof, during the trial every effort was made to force Hu to confess. Hu Feng had the following recollection of this: "When I was first arrested and tried in 1955, I was unable to satisfy repeated questioning about this 'Propaganda Outline' while clarifying events during the period when I was in Wuhan and Nanchang. I was under a lot of mental pressure, and I became nihilistic, adopting an attitude of 'getting it over with.' When the prosecutor asked me what evidence I had, I could only say that the fairly long sentences in the document where similar to the kind I wrote. The prosecutor said that long sentences were a very common way of writing, and not distinctive to me alone, so how could this be regarded as proof? The prosecutor adopted an attitude of disbelief about my 'confession.' Actually, there were some terms and viewpoints in the outline that I did not understand at all... All else aside, I had neither the knowledge nor the ability to write this thing." During the interrogation, not only was Hu Feng repeatedly questioned about this "outline," I was as well. The main prosecutor repeatedly asked leading questions, but I could only answer, "I do not know." Subsequently the chief prosecutor told me, seemingly sincerely: "Someone else has exposed him, so why are you still sheltering him? You're hell-bent on being made a counterrevolutionary with him, aren't you?" However, I did not accept his "kindness." I could only say that I really did not know, and I added, "since someone else has exposed him, that's wonderful. There's no need to question me further." As a result, I was subjected to abuse.

One more point requires explanation. In this article, Lin Mohan quoted Hu Feng's words as follows: "After returning to my native village to take part in the revolution, I suffered some setbacks, and I was misled." His purpose, naturally, was to use Hu Feng's own "confession" to substantiate his "guilt." I never thought that Hu

Feng left the mainstream of the revolution during this period or made a frank condemnation of himself that could be quoted in this way.

The several matters that Comrade Lin Mohan raised were re-investigated by the Ministry of Public Security back in 1985. The ministry came to the conclusion that "some evidence now seems insufficient, but Hu Feng was forced to confess to it at that time. Some of it was found to be untrue long ago." (1985 Ministry of Public Security "Er" [0059] Series, No. 50) Consequently, a conclusion was reached to redress and annul the case. The 1988 "Central Committee Office Supplementary Notice About the Further Rehabilitation of Comrade Hu Feng" (namely the final one of the "CPC Committee's Two Rehabilitation Decisions" that Comrade Lin Mohan said "embodies our party's seeking truth from facts and its spirit of correcting errors, and that also points a clear direction for the correct summary of the historical lessons from the Hu Feng case") gave the following explanation: "In 1985, the Ministry of Public Security re-investigated several remaining problems in Hu Feng's political history, and redressed these problems. Following Central Committee Secretariat approval, a notice of further rehabilitation was issued to the departments concerned." Therefore, a conclusion has in fact been reached about the historical truth of these matters, and they no longer are "matters of political history." I would not have to waste so much ink here, were it not for Comrade Lin Mohan dredging up bygone matters without mentioning the further rehabilitation by the Central Committee. Remember, these past events were not a happy matter for me.

III.

In the article, Lin Mohan candidly explained that he and some other comrades collated the second and third batches of this material. However, he also asserted that "in excerpting and collating this material, we repeatedly checked the original letters to avoid mistaking their original intent." Thus, the excerpting and collating should be in keeping with the letters' original intent. Was this actually the case?

The final item in "The Third Group of Data About the Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Clique" is a letter that Zhang Zhongxiao [1728 0948 2556] wrote to Hu Feng. After excerpting and collating, this section read as follows: "I wrote some essays and poems in the past, and now I am waiting until my health is a little better before writing some more. Over the past two years my disposition has changed a great deal. I hate almost everyone... I detest this social order." The letter was dated after liberation, 27 July 1950. Following excerpting and collating, the following comments on the letter's content were added: "Surprisingly, Zhang Zhongxiao's counterrevolutionary perception is very keen. By comparison with quite a few people in our revolutionary ranks, including some members of the Communist Party, his

degree of class consciousness and his acuteness of political sensitivity is much greater..." In addition, the following section appeared in an editor's note at the beginning of this material: "They expressed deep-seated hatred for the post-liberation society and the people's revolutionary regime. They said 'I detest this social order...'" Comrade Lin Mohan said in his article that "the editor's note in the third batch of materials was completely written by Chairman Mao."

I happen to have obtained the original text of this letter from the Ministry of Public Security, and can use it to fill in the words for which Comrade Lin Mohan substituted ellipsis when he excerpted and rearranged the letter. The original text of the letter reads as follows:

"I wrote some essays and poems in the past, and now I am waiting until my health is a little better before writing some more.

"Over the past two years my disposition has changed a great deal. I hate almost everyone. I have been bed-ridden for the past two years, and my circumstances at home are not very good. I have used the utmost energy to conquer tuberculosis, and I think this is the reason I hate everything. The suffering I have endured during the past two years has been greater than at any time in the past. I understand the meaning of poverty, sickness, and struggle! ...I detest this social order!" (The ellipsis shown here appeared in the original, and the paragraphing is the same as in the original.)

The section just before this one read:

"In May 1948, I suddenly began to spit up a lot of blood. (According to the medical diagnosis, I have had tuberculosis for five or six years.) I spit up two large wash basins of blood. The reason is probably the hardships of the past several years and the 'diligence' of the past two years. Thus I went home, and now another two years have passed."

May 1948 was old China's darkest time, and Zhang Zhongxiao was a young man of 20 when this letter was written.

I do not want to say much more. Anyone can judge fairly accurately what the "letter's original intent" was, as well as whether the way it was excerpted and collated was in keeping with its "original intent" without a need for "repeated verification." Moreover, but for such excerpting and collating, there would probably be no such editor's comment. In his article, Lin Mohan said: "I have always worked based on my own understanding, and based on what I considered at the time to be in keeping with the party's interests and needs. I have not acted contrary to my own convictions or done anything that knowingly ran counter to the party's interests and needs. This was the case in the past, it is the case today, and it will be the case in the future." However, I really cannot understand how such excerpting and collating could "be consistent with the party's interests and

needs." I could not understand it in the past; I do not understand it today, and I will be unable to understand it in the future.

The excerpts and rearrangements of other letters also contain situations similar to what is given as just a tiny example here. There are examples in articles that Comrades Lu Yuan [4845 0626], Ji Fang [0370 3055], and others wrote. Actually, in order to understand a person's private affairs from his personal letters, it is not only necessary to read the full text of the letter, but also to read previous and subsequent letters as well. One must read all the letters. This is probably common sense. If one selects a small number of letters from among a thousand letters with some specific bent or purpose in mind, and then excerpts and rearranges a few phrases and adds explanations, it is bound to create a wrong impression that will produce a mistaken judgment. This point has been demonstrated in practice in the numerous political campaigns that have taken place since 1955, right up to the "Great Cultural Revolution." Comrade Lin Mohan probably also feels a keen sense of personal pain about using such methods that take matters out of context.

This tactic of using private letters played a very great role in bringing a wrongful case against Hu Feng. Comrade Lin Mohan also believes that "this was an important reason why Chairman Mao branded the Hu Feng clique 'a counterrevolutionary clique'." Moreover, I fear that the mistaken impression created by the "three groups of data" has not yet been entirely eradicated. It seems necessary to publish the complete texts of the private letters (all letters sent and received) in their original form in this third batch of data. This is the only way to clarify the 'what' of historical events in order to avoid "spreading falsehoods." Regrettably, only a portion of the original letters can be collected now.

The above is purely for the purpose of explaining historical facts. If a person still insists that he "repeatedly checked the original letters to avoid mistaking their original intent," it is likely that the former erroneous impression created by the "three batches of data" will grow deeper, and that will not help in the correct summarization of the lessons of history.

IV.

In his article, Comrade Lin Mohan also raised the 21 January 1955 Propaganda Department's report to the CPC Central Committee on launching a criticism of Hu Feng's ideology. One passage in the report read as follows: "He believes that the important themes of advocating a communist world view; our advocacy of writers living among workers, peasants, and soldiers; our advocacy of ideological remolding; our advocacy of indigenous Chinese ways; and our advocacy of revolutionary struggle are 'five daggers' pointed at the heads of readers and authors." Subsequently, the "five daggers" became a major crime for which Hu Feng was repeatedly criticized. At Hu's sentencing in 1965, they also became

one of the criminal facts. The following appeared in the written court verdict: "In the spring of 1954, the accused and his key adherents secretly hatched a plot to draft a counterrevolutionary program, namely, the so-called 'Report on the Practice of Literature and Art Since Liberation.' They initiated a savage attack against the CPC and the people's government. In this counterrevolutionary program, the accused termed the CPC's advocacy on the cultural front of a communist world view, a link with workers, peasants, and soldiers, ideological remolding, indigenous Chinese forms, and government service as 'five daggers'..." The effects were extensive. Right up until the 1980 Central Committee notice of Hu Feng's rehabilitation, when this was declared to be a mistake, the formula contained in that Central Committee Propaganda Department report was followed completely. It was not until 1988, when the CPC Central Committee gave further notification of Hu Feng's rehabilitation, that this was redressed as follows: "Repeated investigation shows this thesis to be at variance with Comrade Hu Feng's original intentions. It is to be annulled."

So, what was this variance? The source of the "five daggers" was Hu Feng's "Report on the Practice of Literature and Art Since Liberation," (the so-called 300,000 word report), which was a counter-criticism of the criticism of Comrade Lin Mohan et al. This "report" was carried in the fourth issue of XIN WENXUE SHILIAO in 1988. In order to spare readers the effort of looking it up, I will quote excerpts below:

"All this criticism of me just from Comrades Lin Mohan and He Qifang that one reads in this staunchly factional domain has plunged the following five 'theoretical' daggers into readers and authors:

"To engage in creativity, authors must first of all have a flawless communist world view..."

"One need not take a stand, or one can take less of a stand about only the lives of workers, peasants, and soldiers being real life, and daily life not being real life..."

"Only when one has been ideological remolded can one be creative..."

"Only past ways can be considered Chinese indigenous ways..."

"Distinction as to whether a theme is important or not—the theme determines the value of a work..."

(I added the ellipsis in the foregoing section).

The report of Hu Feng's counter-criticism of Comrade Lin Mohan's criticism that reached the Propaganda Department assumed a different form; at that time Comrade Lin Mohan was director of the Literature and Art Department of the Central Committee Propaganda Department. To this day, Comrade Lin Mohan continues to quote only the Propaganda Department report,

avoiding or not mentioning the fact that in 1988 the Central Committee's notice of further rehabilitation invalidated this thesis.

Comrade Lin Mohan was never able to forget Hu Feng's counter-criticism. In another place in his article, he tried to defend himself as follows: "In his '300,000 word report,' Hu Feng distorted my meaning, quoting out of context the sentence 'first it is necessary to possess a working-class standpoint and a communist world view' to make a refutation. He maintained that this was an 'a priori view,' and that it is an explanation that stems from 'mechanism's abandonment of practice, making the world view a completely rigid thing,' that 'stifles the practice of literature and art and eradicates literature and art per se.' He even generalized this sentence to mean 'anyone who does not first become a true Marxist with an unblemished world view is incapable of realistic creative practice'." Nevertheless, Comrade Lin Mohan did not explain the relationship between this controversy and the "five daggers." Who was right and who was wrong in this controversy, whether Hu Feng did or did not "distort" Comrade Lin Mohan's original meaning, and whether he did or did not "quote out of context," can only be decided in the spirit of the CPC Central Committee's 1988 notice of further rehabilitation: "A correct solution has to be sought in accordance with the constitution's provisions regarding academic freedom and the freedom to criticize, and the party's policy to 'let a hundred flowers bloom.' People in literary and artistic circles and the broad masses of readers employ scientific and regular criticism and discussion of literature and art." Regrettably, Hu Feng can no longer take part in this criticism and discussion. Nevertheless, Comrade Lin Mohan's 1955 charge that Hu Feng's counter-criticism of Lin opposed an "advocacy of the communist world view..." was a "distortion" of Hu Feng's "original meaning." This, I fear, is also a historical fact.

V.

In his article, Comrade Lin Mohan repeatedly stressed the "Hu Feng Clique" (of course, it was not a "counter-revolutionary clique"). At the beginning of the article, he quoted a passage from the 1980 Central Committee rehabilitation notice that said that Hu Feng et al. had engaged in "factional activities." However, he did not cite the exposition on this point contained in the CPC Central Committee's further notice of rehabilitation in 1988. Thus, I must present this passage from the 1988 notice here:

"The notice" (the 1980 rehabilitation notice) said: 'The group consisting of Hu Feng and a small number of comrades had the character of a small clique that conducted factional activities to boycott party leadership of literature and art work and damage the unity of revolutionary art and literature.' Re-investigation has shown that factional problems did indeed exist in the history of development of the country's revolutionary literature camp, which hurt the unity of revolutionary literature and art circles. The reasons leading to this state of affairs

are very complex; they endured for a long period and affected a fairly large number of personnel. Contradictions at different historical stages also exist and change in different ways. A look at the whole history of Comrade Hu Feng's participation in revolutionary and art activities shows that overall he supported the CPC Central Committee politically. Therefore, in the spirit of believing it is better to give the benefit of the doubt than to be petty, and in the spirit of advancing in unity on historical issues, it is impossible to come to a political conclusion about this kind of matter in Central Committee documents. This matter should be invalidated in "the notice."

In addition to this, I must add another comment.

There is just one point that I have found very difficult to understand throughout. Although Lin Mohan expressed full affirmation of and support for the Central Committee's two rehabilitations at the beginning of his article, why did his article only quote or refer to the conclusions of the first rehabilitation notice, which were overturned in the second rehabilitation notice, and why did he always dodge the substance of the 1988 further rehabilitation notice that the Politburo Standing Committee discussed and agreed upon? So far as I know, Comrade Lin Mohan also signed his agreement with the specific content of the second rehabilitation.

VI.

Comrade Lin Mohan's article contains another passage that reads as follows: "On 16 May, the Ministry of Public Security arrested Hu Feng. Before arresting him, the NPC Standing Committee held a meeting that passed a resolution canceling Hu Feng's qualifications as an NPC delegate." I want to make a small correction on this point: The NPC Standing Committee meeting took place on 18 May, which was after the arrest, and not "before." Naturally whether the arrest violated the constitution was at that time a matter of complete indifference.

Thirty-five years have passed since 1955. Even after looking back over the more than 30 years of trials and tribulations, as one of the victims I still feel a sorrow that is difficult to suppress. Nevertheless, the events of the past are over and done with. The CPC Central Committee's two rehabilitation notices, and the "condolences" of the Hu Feng memorial meeting constitute a full rehabilitation of Hu Feng et al. I also fully support the statement in the CPC Central Committee's first rehabilitation notice of 1980, which said: "With the redressing of this wrongful case, comrades in literature and art circles, including Comrade Hu Feng et al., should have a spirit of seeking truth from facts and a positive, forward-looking attitude, strengthen unity, and be of one heart and one mind in contributing to the further flourishing of socialist literature and art for the building of a modern socialist motherland." I believe that comrades in the world of literature and art, including Comrade Lin Mohan, also support this spirit.

Lin Mohan Corrects Previous Assertions on Hu Feng Case

91CM0370A Beijing ZUOPIN YU ZHENGMIN
[LITERARY WORKS AND CONTENTION]
in Chinese No 2, 17 Feb 91 pp 78-79, 40

[Article by Huang Huaying (7806 5478 5391): "Several Clarifications, Additions and Corrections—Record of Interview With Comrade Lin Mohan"; originally published in WENYI BAO 13 Oct 90]

[Text] In August 1990, XIN WENXUE SHILIAO [NEW LITERATURE HISTORICAL DATA] published an article titled "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case" in which Comrade Lin Mohan commented to me on the case. In February 1991, Comrade Mei Zhi [2734 1807] published an article in XIN WENXUE SHILIAO titled "Historical Truth" in which she aired some disagreements about the viewpoints and historical data presented in my article. For this reason I paid a call on Comrade Lin Mohan. A collation of our conversation will now be provided below.

Huang: Comrade Lin Mohan, did you read Comrade Mei Zhi's article titled "Historical Truth"? What do you think of her article? Do you care to comment?

Lin: In the article, "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case," I recalled primarily the historical process by which the Hu Feng case began and evolved. Comrade Mei Zhi aired some disagreements about several matters in the article. My thoughts are as follows: First, the recounting of a historical incident must be in keeping with the historical facts. Rarely are views of historical incidents completely identical. Everyone is entitled to a difference of opinion. Second, where there is conflicting historical data about verified facts and simple facts, verification should be done with an attitude of seeking truth from facts in order to provide explanations, additions, and corrections. Third, as a victim of the case of the "Hu Feng counterrevolutionary clique," Comrade Mei Zhi suffered many years of hardship, and her feelings are understandable. I must be sure to take her views into consideration.

Huang: Which questions do you feel require answers and explanation?

Lin: I would like to explain, add to, and correct several matters of historical fact.

The first pertains to the Hu Feng historical issue.

Why was it necessary to raise historical matters regarding Hu Feng in "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case"? The charging and sentencing of Hu Feng as a "counterrevolutionary" was very much related to matters of a historical nature that concerned him; thus they had to be discussed. I remember that after Hu Feng was arrested, one of his old friends disclosed that after he had failed in the great revolution, Hu worked in the Kuomintang's Jiangxi Provincial Party Headquarters. There he wrote an "Anti-Communist Propaganda Outline." The

Ministry of Public Security subsequently found this reactionary propaganda in the Ji'an Library in Jiangxi. At the time, Hu Feng was questioned many times about whether he had written the outline, but he always said he did not remember having done so.

Inasmuch as I had no data at hand about historical matters pertaining to Hu Feng, and since I feared that depending on memory alone was unreliable, out of prudence I invited a comrade who was from a department concerned and who had been in charge of the Hu Feng case concerned to help me check the data. I mailed him the final proof of the article, to which I appended the following letter:

"I am sending you the final proof of an article titled 'The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case' and ask that you check it. In particular, I ask that you consider whether the information about Hu working in the Kuomintang's party headquarters and writing an 'Anti-Communist Propaganda Outline' and another article titled 'Signed, Zhang Guming' is correct. Is this a proper accounting? If not, please correct it. I supposed that when he was rehabilitated this matter might be regarded as a historical issue that need not be raised again. However, in writing about events in the Hu Feng case, the matter had to be raised, because this was an important experience he went through."

Several days later, I received a reply. The letter said the following:

"After checking the files about the inquiry on several matters regarding Hu Feng, the answer is as follows:

"A re-examination report and a Central Committee directive state that, from 1927 until the fall of 1928, Hu Feng held reactionary positions as a secretary in the Kuomintang's Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters and as section chief of the propaganda section of the political department of the 31st Communist Suppression Army in Chaogong, Jiangxi. He was responsible for editing a publication of the Kuomintang's Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters titled WUHAN PINGLUN [WUHAN REVIEW], as well as a supplement to GUOMIN RIBAO, the Jiangxi Provincial Party Headquarters' newspaper. He also wrote anti-communist articles, including an 'Anti-Communist Propaganda Outline,' 'Anti-Communism, Today and Tomorrow,' and 'Southern Hubei Tragedy,' and conducted propaganda to incite counterrevolution. These are facts about which Hu Feng has now 'admitted complete guilt'."

Based on the information in this reply, I wrote the following in "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case": After Hu Feng was arrested, an old friend named Zhu disclosed—and this has been verified—that during the Northern Expedition, Hu was a member of the Socialist Youth League. However, after the great revolution failed, he worked in the propaganda section of the political department of the 31st Communist Suppression

Army in Chaofong, Jiangxi, where he wrote the "Chaogong Propaganda Outline," (the "Communist Suppression Propaganda Outline"). "Chaogong" was a slip of the pen.

Comrade Mei Zhi's article took exception to this, saying that the Ministry of Public Security had re-investigated these matters in 1985 and decided to redress and rescind the matters. In order to clarify the Central Committee's conclusions about Hu Feng's historical matters, I followed the lead provided in Mei Zhi's article, again requesting the comrade concerned to check the relevant documents.

A check revealed that the data from the files that the comrade provided in the letter of reply had been copied from a statement that the CPC Central Committee had approved and forwarded to the party organizations of the Ministry of Public Security, the Supreme People's Procuratorate, and the Supreme People's Court; the statement pertained to the "Re-examination Report on the Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Clique Case." In May 1985 the Ministry of Public Security sent to the CPC Central Committee Secretariat a "Request For Instructions on Handling the Hu Feng Appeal Problem." The "request" maintained that the historical period during which Hu Feng was a secretary in the propaganda department of the Kuomintang's Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters and a section chief in the propaganda section of the political department of the 31st Communist Suppression Army in Jiangxi was nearly 60 years ago. On the basis of existing materials, it would be difficult to ascertain the character of the Hubei Provincial Party Headquarters and the 31st Army in Jiangxi at that time, and there was no need for a re-investigation. Therefore, deletion of the terms "Chaogong Army," "reactionary duties," "anti-communist articles," and "propaganda inciting counterrevolution" was being considered. The "request" maintained that the "Anti-Communist Propaganda Outline" was not signed, nor was the original draft of the "outline" found. Only Zhu Qixia [2612 0120 7209] claimed that Hu Feng had drafted it. However, Hu Feng consistently denied it. The claims of a single person could not stand, so the issue of "writing an anti-communist propaganda outline" should be deleted from the re-investigation report. The Ministry of Public Security's "request" was approved by the CPC Central Committee Secretariat. In November 1985, the Ministry of Public Security informed Hu Feng's family and his unit of the results of the re-investigation of Hu's appeal. However, I did not see these two documents before the review and the verification.

A second matter that I want to explain pertains to the excerpts and collation of letters of Hu Feng et al. When I wrote about excerpting and collating these letters in "The Ins and Outs of the Hu Feng Case," I said, "We repeatedly checked the original letters to avoid mistaking their original intent." These words reflected the

subjective desire at that time of the comrades who participated in collating the letters. However, because of a failure to fully check and verify things, some things that violated the facts remained. In the final section of the article, which discussed what lessons should be drawn, I said, "I believe that the final lesson is that a full investigation and study was not done. Contradictions of two different natures were muddled together. A case in point was the implication of A Long, who provided the party and the army with enemy intelligence before liberation. However, merely on the basis of obscure phrases in the letters, and without any investigation or verification, he would have been made out as an enemy intelligence agent, which would have opened him up to an injustice that would not have been righted. This would have been a painful lesson."

Finally, I want to explain, add to, and correct a matter pertaining to the timing and the legal procedures related to Hu Feng's arrest.

In my article I said that "On 16 May, the Ministry of Public Security arrested Hu Feng. Before his arrest, the NPC Standing Committee held a meeting and passed a decision to annul Hu Feng's status in the NPC."

Comrade Mei Zhi's article objects to this: "The NPC Standing Committee held a meeting on 18 May, which was after the arrest and not 'before.' Of course, at that time, whether the arrest violated the constitution was entirely a moot point."

In this regard, I again requested a comrade concerned to verify the situation. According to the investigation, the July 1980 "Re-investigation Report of the Hu Feng Counterrevolutionary Clique Case" by party organizations of the Ministry of Public Security stated that on 17 May, the Ministry of Public Security requested that the NPC Standing Committee approve Hu Feng's detention. On 18 May, following approval by the 16th meeting of the First NPC Standing Committee, Hu Feng was arrested and tried.

This proves that the date of Hu Feng's detention was not 16 May, as stated in my report, but rather 17 May. Before detaining and arresting Hu Feng, the Ministry of Public Security went through legal procedures. In his article "Literature and Arts News and the Wrongful Case Against Hu Feng," Comrade Kang Zhuo [1660 3451] referred to Chairman Mao's remark to Zhou Yang as follows: "Hu Feng is under arrest, yet he is an NPC delegate. The NPC Standing Committee must give its approval before he can be arrested." This is inconsistent with the information in the Ministry of Public Security document.

As to the other issues raised in Comrade Mei Zhi's article, I consider them to be matters of opinion. Everyone is entitled to a different opinion.

NTIS
ATTN: PROCESS 103
5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.